

THE REFORMED CHURCH REVIEW

No. 3.—JULY—1919.

I.

THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF THE APOSTOLIC CHURCH.

PHILIP VOLLMER.

The Bible cannot be adequately understood without some knowledge of its historical setting. Any reader can understand his personal duty from the Bible without such knowledge, but truly scientific Bible study is hopeless without it. This principle is of course to be applied also to the sources for the history of the Apostolic Church. Much, however, of what was written on this subject a generation ago, even by specialists, is at the present stage of New Testament science out of date, owing to the recent extensive researches of incisive importance, conducted by specialists like Deissmann, Gregory, Moulton, Case, A. T. Robertson, Dobschütz, Cobern and others. I will therefore make an attempt in this paper to offer, on the basis of the researches by these men, a sketch of the physical, political, intellectual, religious, social and moral world in which the Apostolic Church took its rise and began to develop her peculiar life.

Recommended Literature.—Cobern, *The New Archaeological Discoveries and Their Bearing upon the New Testament and upon the Life and Times*

292 *The Historical Background of the Apostolic Church.*

of the *Primitive Church*; (2) Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East*; (3) Clemen, *Primitive Christianity and its Non-Jewish Sources*; (4) Case, *Evolution of Early Christianity*, p. 26: "The Importance of Environment for Christian Origins"; (5) Jones, M. T., *The New Testament in the Twentieth Century*, pp. 1-11; (6) Hall, T. C., *Historical Setting of the Early Gospel*.

I. THE PHYSICAL WORLD OF THE APOSTOLIC CHURCH.

The majority of the Apostolic Churches were scattered about the Mediterranean Sea. Harnack has made a list of places where Christians and Christian communities can be traced in New Testament times, and it is both astonishingly large and of wide geographical range, showing that as early as the first generation Christianity had become a world-wide movement of cosmopolitan character. This fact and the vastness of the task yet before the Church can best be illustrated by a classified enumeration of the principal localities mentioned in the book of Acts.

Implicitly every one of the three *continents*, known to the ancients—Asia, Europe and Africa—is alluded to in the New Testament. Of the important *seas* four are mentioned: (1) The Mediterranean Sea. Voyages on it are referred to in Acts 9:30; 13:4; 21:1, 2; 27:3. (2) The Black Sea, north of Asia Minor. (3) The Ægean Sea, between Asia Minor and Greece. Voyages upon it in Acts 6:11; 18:18; 20:13-15. (4) The Adriatic Sea, between Greece and Italy (Acts 27:27). Five *islands* are named: (1) Cyprus, in the north-east corner of the Mediterranean (Acts 4:36; 13:4). (2) Crete, south of the Ægean Sea, between Asia Minor and Greece (Acts 27:7; Titus 1:5). (3) Patmos, in the Ægean Sea, not far from Ephesus (Rev. 1:9). (4) Sicily, south-west of Italy (Acts 28:12). (5) Melita, now Malta, south of Italy (Acts 28:1). The different *provinces* mentioned may be arranged in four groups: (a) Those on the continent of Europe are: (1) Thrace, (2) Macedonia (Acts 14:9, 10; 20:1-3). (3) Greece, also called Achaia (Acts 18:12; 20:3). (4) Illyricum or Dalmatia (Rom. 15:19). (5)

Italy (Acts 27:1). (6) Spain. (b) Those on the continent of Africa are: (1) Africa Proper. (2) Libya (Acts 2:10). (3) Egypt (Mt. 2:13). (c) Those on the continent of Asia, exclusive of Asia Minor, are: (1) Arabia, perhaps referring to the desert region, southeast of Palestine (Gal. 1:17). (2) Judea, the Jewish name for all Palestine, in the New Testament period (Luke 1:5). (3) Phœnicia (Mark 7:24; Acts 15:3; 21:2). (4) Syria, north of Palestine (Acts 15:41; 20:3). The fourteen provinces in *Asia Minor*, so frequently mentioned in the Acts and Epistles, may be divided into four groups: (a) Three on the Black Sea, beginning on the East: (1) Pontus (Acts 18:2). (2) Paphlagonia. (3) Bithynia (I. Peter 1:1). (b) Three on the Ægean Sea, beginning on the North. (4) Mysia (Acts 16:17). (5) Lydia. (6) Caria. These three provinces together formed the district known as "Asia" (Acts 2:9; 19:10). (c) Three on the Mediterranean Sea, beginning on the west: (7) Lycia (Acts 27:5). (8) Pamphylia (Acts 13:13). (9) Cilicia (Acts 21:39). (d) Five in the interior: (10) On the North: Galatia (Gal. 1:2). (11) On the east, Cappadocia (Acts 2:9). (12) On the southeast, Lycaonia (Acts 14:6). (13) On the southwest, Pisidia (Acts 13:14). (14) On the west: Phrygia (Acts 16:6).

Recommended Literature.—Harnack, *Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries*, II, p. 97; Ramsey, *Historical Geography of Asia Minor*; Case, *Environment of Early Christianity*, p. 48, on "The Mediterranean World in New Testament Times"; Outline Maps of the Apostolic Age, at the McKinley Publishing Company, Philadelphia, Pa.

II. THE POLITICAL WORLD OF THE APOSTOLIC CHURCH.

Back of the history of the primitive Church looms up the colossus of the mighty Roman Empire. It exerted a tremendous influence, both for good and evil, on the fortunes of the new religion. Palestine was an integral part of its vast domain, and in that country stood the cradle of the infant Church. A Roman governor crucified the Head of the Church

and Roman officials first protected and later persecuted the Church. On the other side, it was, to a large extent, Græco-Roman civilization which made possible Christianity's marvelous progress mentioned in Chapter I., by the unbroken "pax Romana," forced upon the peoples encircling the Mediterranean; by breaking down many political and racial barriers, thus preparing the nations for the idea of a world citizenship; by the building of the famous Roman highways over valleys, mountains and rivers, admired and used to this day, thus making travel easier and rapid; by its imperial postal service which promoted intercourse and commerce.

All of the Roman emperors of the first century are either named or alluded to in the New Testament. Even their succession and the exact years of their reign are indicated in some passages. And as these facts have a decisive bearing on the chronology of the Apostolic Age and on the correct interpretation of important passages, such as Rev. 17:8, a brief sketch of their lives will be of service to our present purpose. (1) *Augustus*, 31 B.C. to 14 A.D. (Luke 2:1). The Temple of Janus was closed which was an indication that universal peace reigned throughout the world, when Jesus the "Prince of Peace" was born. The defeat of the Roman legions by Hermann, 9 A.D., in the Teutoburg Forest, was the last serious attempt of the Romans to subjugate the Germans beyond the Rhine. He rebuilt and beautified Rome. (2) *Tiberius*, 14-37 (Lk. 3:1), a great military commander and at first an able ruler. By degrees, owing to dissensions with his wife, he became gloomy and suspicious and ended his life as a cruel and revengeful tyrant. He spent the last eight years of his life on the beautiful island of Capri. Under his reign Jesus died, and it is said that Pilate sent him a report of the trial. Of the people he said, "Let them hate me, provided they respect me." (3) *Caligula*, 37-41. His actions indicate insanity. He demanded divine honors, delighted in bloodshed, wished the Roman people might have only one neck so that he might

cut it off with a single stroke, had his favorite horse appointed a Consul, built a bridge from the Capitoline hill to the Palatine in order to be nearer to the temple of Jupiter, whose equal he considered himself to be. His motto was, "Let the people hate me, provided they fear me." He drove the Jews to desperation by demanding that his statue be put into the Temple at Jerusalem. (4) *Claudius*, 41-54, a man of learning, but weak and the slave of his two wicked wives, the second of which poisoned him. Under him Britain was conquered, the great aqueducts at Rome completed, and the Jews expelled from Rome (Acts 18:2). He laid down the significant principle: "It is right that men should live in the religion of their country." He also instituted humane laws in behalf of slaves. For the first time in the history of Rome the killing of a slave by his master was branded as a capital offense. (5) *Nero*, 54-68. He came to the throne at the age of seventeen years, as the result of the intrigues of his mother, Agrippina. For the first eight years of his reign he left the administration of affairs in the hands of the famous Burrus, the prefect of the Prætorian guard, and of his teacher Seneca, the Stoic philosopher, and matters went well. After the death of Burrus, in 62 A.D., Nero took hold of the government himself. He compelled Seneca to commit suicide and during the entire period following proved himself a knave beyond comparison, killing his mother, wife and brother. In 64, he set fire to Rome and put the blame on the Christians. This charge led to the first persecution of the Christians in 64-67, in which according to tradition Peter was crucified and Paul beheaded. When a revolution in the armies of Gaul, Spain and Germany broke out against him, he committed suicide, his last words being, "What a great artist dies with me." (Read *Quo Vadis*.) During the anarchy following Nero's suicide four emperors were crowned in quick succession (68-69). Concerning three of them: (6) Galba, (7) Otho, (8) Vitellius (69), interpreters are not agreed whether they should be

counted in the enumeration implied in Rev. 17:8, as they were elected and deposed by corruption. (9) *Vespasian*, 69-79. He was the general in the war against the Jews at the time he was elected. He succeeded in restoring peace to the empire and in reorganizing the government, by curtailing the prerogatives of the old Roman nobles and giving representation in the Senate to the provinces and cities. He also built the famous Colosseum. (10) *Titus*, 79-81, the son of Vespasian, won all hearts by his justice and humanity. "I have lost a day," he would say, when he had passed a day without having done an act of kindness. The eruption of Mt. Vesuvius, destroying Herculaneum and Pompeii, occurred during his reign. (11) *Domitian*, 81-96, brother of Titus, a scholar expressing high moral sentiments, but nevertheless a tyrant of the worst type. He cited the relatives of Jesus to appear before him, because he had a suspicion that they might revive the claims of Jesus to the throne of David. During his reign the second of the ten great persecutions of the Christians occurred, during which he is said to have banished the Apostle John to Patmos.

III. THE POLITICAL CONDITION OF THE JEWS.

Since 722 and 588 B.C. the Jews had been living under foreign rule. In the Apostolic Age the Romans were their overlords, and they ruled them indirectly through Herodian princes or directly through Roman procurators. Seven members of the Herodian family are mentioned in the New Testament, representing four generations, six of them being rulers of various parts of Palestine. Their names, as given in the New Testament, and supplemented by their fuller names as given by Josephus and other authors, are as follows: (1) Herod the king (Mt. 2:1; Luke 1:5)—"Herod the Great"; the next four were sons of his: (2) Archelaus (Mt. 2:22); (3) Herod the Tetrarch (Luke 3:1; 13:32; 23:7)—"Herod Antipas"; (4) Philip the Tetrarch (Luke 3:1); (5)

Philip (Mt. 14:3), residing in Rome, but not a ruler; (6) Herod the king (Acts 12:7)—“Herod Agrippa I,” grandson of Herod the Great; (7) Agrippa the king (Acts 25:13)—“Herod Agrippa II,” the son of Agrippa I.

The rulers over the various provinces of Palestine were changed with such confusing frequency during the Apostolic Age that only a complete list of the rulers of each separate province will make matters clear to the student of Acts.

1. *Rulers over Judea and Samaria.*

37-4 B.C.—Herod the Great.

4 B.C.-6 A.D.—Archelaus.

6 A.D.-41 A.D.—Roman Governors. Pilate being the fifth, 26-36.

41-44 A.D.—Herod Agrippa I.

44-70—Roman Governors: Felix 52-60; Festus, 60-62.

2. *Rulers over Galilee and Perea.*

37-4 B.C.—Herod the Great.

4 B.C.-39—Herod Antipas.

39-44—Agrippa I.

44-70—The Roman Governors of Judea and, from 53-101 A.D., Agrippa II over parts of Galilee and Perea.

3. *Rulers of the Northeastern Territory.*

37-4 B.C.—Herod the Great.

4 B.C.-33 A.D.—Philip the Tetrarch.

33-37—The Roman Governor of Syria.

37-44—Agrippa I.

44-49—The Roman Governor of Judea.

49-101—Agrippa II, exchanges of territory being made several times during his long reign.

The above sketch shows that three times during this period the whole of Palestine was consolidated under one ruler:

37-4 B.C. under Herod the Great.

41-44 A.D., under Agrippa I.

44-70, under Roman Governors.

Though the rule of the Romans and her vassals was autocratic and harsh, they considered it the part of wisdom to allow the Jews a considerable measure of home-rule, the amount of which was increased or diminished according to men and circumstances. This power lay in the hands of the high-priest and the general or local Sanhedrins. But nothing could repay the Jews for the loss of their independence. They were all the time in a chronic state of concealed rebellion, and when Rome, in 44 A.D., took the government of the whole of Palestine directly in its own hands, dissatisfaction rose to such fervor that matters drifted slowly but surely into open rebellion. The heroic struggle of a small but liberty-loving people should be read in detail in one of the books named below. After a period of general anarchy, open rebellion broke out in A.D. 66. It took the Roman legions four years to suppress it. By the spring of A.D. 70, Vespasian had conquered the whole country, except Jerusalem. This city he turned over to his son, Titus, as he meanwhile had been proclaimed emperor. The following September, after a siege in which the frantic defenders endured unparalleled sufferings, the city was captured, razed to the ground, the Temple destroyed, the wretched survivors slain or sold into slavery, and the ruins occupied by a Roman garrison.

But while Roman rule and Greek culture invaded the homeland of the Jews, they themselves invaded all sections of the Græco-Roman world in ever increasing numbers, so that in the Apostolic Age the majority of the Jews were living outside of Palestine. These were known as the "Dispersion" and called "Hellenists," because they used the Greek language and adopted to some extent Greek customs and culture, while the Jews in Palestine and east of it were known as "Hebrews." There were four sections of the Dispersion: (1) the original dispersion in Babylon; (2) in Syria and Asia Minor (Antioch); (3) in Egypt (Alexandria); (4) in the West (Rome). The presence of Jews wherever the Christian missionaries

came partly facilitated and partly retarded the work of the young Church.

Recommended Literature.—(1) Art. "Roman Empire" in *Hasting's Dictionary of the Apostolic Church*, II, p. 401. (2) Vollmer, *The Modern Student's Life of Christ*, pp. 8-18. (3) On the Herodian rulers, *Hasting's Dictionary of the Apostolic Church*, I, p. 564. (4) Riggs, *A History of the Jewish People*, pp. 257-317. (5) Josephus, "Antiquities" and "The Jewish War." (6) Ramsay's art. on "Roads and Travel" in *Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible*, extra volume. (7) Articles in *Hasting's Dictionary of the Apostolic Church*, on "Trade and Commerce," II, p. 600; on Roman Law, II, p. 404; on "Rome," II, p. 417; on "Sanhedrin," II, p. 454. (8) Morrison, *The Jews under Roman Rule*; on Domitian, Ayer, *Source Book*, pp. 11-12; Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*.

III. THE INTELLECTUAL WORLD OF THE APOSTLES.

Christianity arose in a highly developed intellectual age. The lands around the Mediterranean Sea had for millenniums been occupied successively by a variety of civilizations, by the Assyrians, Babylonians, the Hittites, Egyptians, Phœnicians, Jews, Greeks and Macedonians. The merit of Alexander the Great was that he attempted to unify all the cultural elements and establish a universal world culture, by a process of fusion, instead of following the method of ancient and modern conquerors of trying to destroy the civilization he found and impose his own upon the conquered people. Rome continued this process of unification and extended its results. The new type of culture is commonly called "Hellenistic," because Greek achievements formed its foundation.

The individual contributions of each of the three most important nations, then holding sway, to this common world-culture may be briefly sketched as follows.

The *Jewish contribution* consisted mainly in their rich literature which falls into five classes: the Old Testament canon; the Apocrypha; the Apocalyptic books; their literature on philosophy and history; and writings which have been gradually collected into what is known as the Talmud. The strongest intellectual influences which pervaded the Jewish

world of thought in this period are known as Alexandrianism, which term denotes Judaism under the influence of Greek philosophy. The great leaders of this movement, Philo and others, made the ambitious attempt to show that there exists an entire harmony between the Old Testament Scriptures and Greek philosophy, making use of the allegorical method of interpretation. This Alexandrian type of teaching differed materially from Pharisaic rabbinism as to subject, general spirit and broadmindedness. Angelology was highly developed, a hierarchy of angels being conceived of as the mediators between God and man, administering the world and culminating finally in a Logos. But Philo's Logos was nothing more than an adaptation to Jewish conceptions of Plato's "ideas" and the "immanent reason" of the Stoics. Space forbids to continue the discussion of this broad subject.

The Greek contribution to the world culture of the Apostolic times, as of all subsequent ages, is simply immense. In their philosophy they grappled with the three never dying problems of ontology, epistemology and of ethics, raising the important questions: What are the ultimate factors that account for the origin of the world and its continuance; what is truth; is it mere opinion; can man acquire a knowledge of ultimate reality; are our senses trustworthy; and if they are, how may the many differences of opinion on the same subject be explained; what is the summum bonum; how may we get rid of tradition and breathe the purer air of liberty as to ethical standards?

The three most influential schools of philosophy in the first century were the Epicureans, the Cynics and the Stoics. (1) *The Epicureans* were free thinking scientists, holding that matter was the only ultimate reality and that the senses were the only guides to be trusted in the quest for truth. All the current superstitions they unhesitatingly threw overboard. They were ready to grant that the gods existed, but not that they exerted any direct influence on the life of men. The

crowning virtue of the Epicureans was their sturdy loyalty to facts as they saw them. Their philosophy, however, was cold, entirely devoid of higher inspiration. (2) *Cynicism*, whose founder was a pupil of Socrates, aimed to teach men how to live true to nature. This ideal was often carried to crude extremes. The Cynic philosophers were sincerely devoted to the interests of the masses. Most of them lived lives of noble self-sacrifice and undoubtedly exerted a great influence on the people. (3) A very popular philosophy was *Stoicism*. It taught that the ultimate reality in the universe was not matter but reason, and that the final source of reason was God. It is the Logos, or divine Reason, which binds men to God. All men, therefore, are divine in so far as that divine Reason enters into them and they follow its guidance. Like Christ, they taught that the supreme task in life was to do the divine will, and that the will of God is done by living a virtuous life in the service of man. In theory at least, Stoicism was democratic, for it taught that all men possessed the divine Reason. They believed that pain and suffering possess a positive value in developing the individual and that therefore they should be patiently and joyously borne. In dealing with the old mythologies they, like the Jews of the dispersion, employed the allegorical method of interpretation. Stoics advocated the retention of the older forms of religion, as long as they were helpful in developing the individual. Regarding man's future immortality, their teachings, especially in the first Christian century, were vague and uncertain.

To the prosperous and educated man these systems had much to offer. But for the outcast this religion of Reason gave but cold comfort. At the same time these philosophies, especially Stoicism, were in a very real sense pioneers of Christianity. The belief that all men were children of God, that communication between him and them was possible and that the end of existence was to do God's will by living a virtuous and self-sacrificing life prepared men for accepting

Christianity which, as to its essence, is most certainly a religion of practical piety and holiness of life. The doctrine of the Logos, or Divine Reason, as the bond between God and man was also destined to exert a powerful influence upon certain phases of Christian thinking, finding acceptance in the opening verses of John's Gospel.

Last but not least, Greece contributed to civilization a most beautiful, pliable language as a means of world communication and thus greatly facilitated the spread of the Gospel.

Rome's contribution to world civilization has been touched upon in Chapter II. In philosophy, art and science the Romans were greatly dependent on the Greeks, but in working out principles of government, and in the capacity of organizing human affairs they are still in part the teachers of the world.

Recommended Literature.—This all too brief sketch of a great inspiring subject should be supplemented by copious collateral reading.—Case, *Evolution of Early Christianity*, Chap. III, on "The Mediterranean World"; also pp. 239, 258-276; Vollmer, *The Modern Student's Life of Christ*, pp. 19-24; Grant, *Between the Testament*; "Hellenism," in *Hasting's Dictionary of the Apostolic Church*, I, p. 547; on "Philo," *Hasting's Dictionary of the Apostolic Church*, II, p. 227; Clemen, *Primitive Christianity*, pp. 41-47; Pfleiderer, *Christian Origins*, pp. 31-133: "Greek Philosophy and Christianity"; Breed, *Preparation of the World for Christ*, pp. 205-370: on the mission of the Greeks; on Greek Philosophy: Ueberweg, *History of Philosophy*, I, pp. 185-259; Jones, *The New Testament in the Twentieth Century*, p. 122; Angus, *Environment of Early Christianity*, p. 186; *Hasting's Dictionary of the Apostolic Church*, II, p. 526; art. in *Encyclopaedia Britannica*; on New Testament Greek: *Dictionary of Apostolic Church*, I, p. 551; Deissmann, *Light from Ancient East*, pp. 54-142; Jones, *The New Testament in the Twentieth Century*, pp. 163-186; Robertson, *Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, pp. 3-8; Cobern, *New Archaeological Discoveries*, pp. 3-119; *The Teaching of Epictetus*, translated by Rolleson; Guizot, *History of Civilization*, pp. 1-25; On the art of "Writing," *Hasting's Dictionary of the Apostolic Church*, II, p. 699.

IV. RELIGIOUS CONDITIONS IN THE WORLD OF THE APOSTLES.

When the Apostles offered the world a new religion they did not find virgin soil to cultivate, but rather a field occupied by many formidable competitors. Paul's clever "captatio ben-

evolentiaē" at Athens (Acts 17:22) was literally true of the whole world.

The Jew's profound interest in religion is well known, and so our survey of it may be brief. Some of the *bright features* of Jewish religious life were its glowing Messianic hope; its rich literature throbbing with high ideals; its missionary zeal; its religious revivals at the reunions on the great feasts; its Bible study in the synagogues; its strength to produce martyrs; its pious characters, such as Zacharias and Elizabeth, Mary, Simeon, Nicodemus, Hillel, Gamaliel. The *dark side* of first century Judaism appears in its religious factionalism, its externalization of religion, its perversion of the Messianic ideal; its bigotry and political fanaticism.

The study of the religious setting which the *Græco-Roman world* furnished for the life of early Christianity is more important for our present purpose because the details of it and its influence on the life and literature of the Church are not so well known. Also here we should distinguish between a dark and a bright side. Usually the first is overemphasized, but the new science of comparative religions enables truth-loving scholars to see the other side also. The *dark side* is well known. At the time of Christ, disbelief in popular religion had become very general among the educated classes. Augustus strove in vain to restore religion to its former position, and even assumed personally the office of Pontifex Maximus. The practice of deifying and worshipping the emperors exerted a most degrading influence on the religious life. Many Græco-Romans, to satisfy their religious cravings, embraced Judaism; others were imposed upon by Oriental priests, sorcerers, sooth-sayers and astrologers, like Apollonius of Tyana (3 B.C. to 96 A.D.). While the upper classes treated current mythology as fables, they were the ready dupes of every quack and foreign cult. Harlots, like Poppæa, Nero's wife, were deified, and sacrifices were offered for the preservation of "Nero's divine voice." Yet religion was far from being dead.

It was a subject of very general interest, being discussed by poets, philosophers and even statesmen. The very criticism of traditional religion by educated men evinces interest in the subject. Moreover, satirists like Juvenal and Lucian who are usually quoted by Christian writers to prove the complete decadence of pagan religion, have been proven to be perverters of the real facts. As is the case in our own days, it did not suit the purpose of these humorists to portray in their true colors—if indeed they had the ability to appreciate—the deeper current of religious life among their people.—A brief sketch of the principal types of pagan religions will prove our contention. Four groups may be distinguished: (1) the traditional religion; (2) the religion of the philosophers; (3) the Emperor-Worship; (4) the Mystery Cults.

In the popular religion, long before the first century, the gods of Greece had been merged in thought into those of ancient Rome in such a way that a regular Pantheon developed, consisting of a great variety of gods, some purely Greek, like Apollo, some purely Roman, like Janus. Gradually a kind of theology was worked out to bring some uniformity into the contradictory beliefs of the people, but this endeavor was as little successful as similar attempts by Christian theologians. The poems of Homer were still the Bible of traditional pagan religion and the standard of orthodoxy. The more grotesque and immoral features of the Homeric gods were explained away by the allegorical method of interpretation. Men who dared to criticize traditional mythology were subjected to ostracism, banishment and even death. The martyrdom of Socrates is the best known example of what a dissenter might expect. More and more these gods became to the popular mind mere evil demons constantly intent upon harming mortals. Hence the worship of them was born of fear. They are jealous and must be appeased by sacrifices. Schiller, in his ballad, "Der Ring des Polycrates," describes this popular fear of the jealousy of the gods in exquisitely beautiful lan-

guage; yet, in his other, no less famous poem, "Die Goetter Griechenlands," he idealizes the Græco-Roman pantheon and laments its downfall through Christianity: "Einen zu bereichern unter Allen musste diese Goetterwelt vergehn."

By the *Religion of Philosophy* we understand the more clarified and elevated religious ideas held by the educated classes in the Græco-Roman world. It showed many varieties, corresponding to the different types of philosophy then current. Their attitude toward popular religion was one of criticism. They expressed, *e. g.*, strong dissent from many of the more grotesque features of contemporaneous polytheism. As early as the sixth century B.C., Xenophanes criticized the idea of portraying deity in human form, thus making man the creator of the gods. He writes: "If oxen, horses and lions had hands with which to make images they would picture the gods as oxen, horses and lions." In Xenophanes' own opinion there is one god and he cannot be represented in anthropomorphic form. Serious objections were raised by cultured persons especially to the grotesque and scandalous immoralities attributed to the gods by Homer. "Self-respecting men would never act so disgracefully, much less would real gods thus deport themselves," says Cicero in his *De Nat. Deorum*. As to the origin of the idea of gods Democritus anticipated Schopenhauer and other modern philosophers in tracing the beliefs in gods to the fear which the more terrible phenomena of nature—thunder, lightning, earthquakes, eclipses—awakened in men. Others held that the stories about gods were at the outset simply legends of heroic men exaggerated in order to exalt them above mortals. Radical philosophers advocated a religion of fatalism and pantheism. For example, Demetrius, in the fourth century B.C. considered mere chance, fortune (τύχη), the cause of all that happens. Other thinkers placed more stress on the orderly procedure of nature which they called Fate (ἀνάγκη) or Destiny (εἰμαρμένη). To this however the objection was raised that it was unworthy of an intelligent

man to attribute all phenomena to chance rather than to an intelligent cause. The life of an individual might seem to contain much uncertainty but the perpetual motion of the heavens, and the harmony of the entire universe transcended the powers of human comprehension and must be divine. Pantheism (*παν-θεος*) was strongly advocated by Greeks as well as Orientals. They held that the universe itself is god, it being fully complete and perfect in all its parts. This view resulted in the deification, not only of the heavenly bodies but also of the elements—fire, air, water, and earth, as well as the phenomena of time—seasons, months, weeks, days, hours.

By far the larger number of the educated classes in the first century leaned more and more toward what is called syncretism in religion. By this term is meant that development of pagan religion which recognizes the universality and identity of the religious sentiment, but has not yet advanced to the conception of a genuine unity of the divine nature, a real monotheism. It is polytheistic, but a form of polytheism which embraces all nations, seeing in their different systems of gods only varying names for the same being. For example, it was an act of syncretism when the Romans identified their Minerva with the Greek Athena and their Jupiter with the Greek Zeus. This growing sentiment accounts for the tolerant attitude of Rome toward foreign religions. Emperor Severus (third century) is said to have placed in his private sanctuary even the busts of Moses and Jesus besides those of Jupiter and Apollo.

Emperor-Worship was the third form of religion prevalent in the Roman empire. This cult was the product of a long evolutionary process. The idea came from the Orient, where the people had always been more submissive to their superiors. From hoary antiquity priests and rulers succeeded in making the people believe that kings were divine beings. In ancient Egypt and Babylon they were believed to be divine through an incarnation. Recent excavations have shown that the ancient

Babylonian kings, Sargon I. and Maram Sin, in the fourth millennium B.C., placed before their names the determinative syllable for god—"ilu." Gudea, the Sumerian king of ancient Lagash, prayed to a goddess: "I have no mother, thou art my mother. I have no father, thou art my father. In the sanctuary thou didst bear me." The rulers of Egypt were believed not to suffer the fate of ordinary mortals at death, but to go by a royal road to dwell with Ra forever, the gods greeting him upon his arrival as one of themselves. Sometimes these new gods were credited with pre-existence, divine parentage and miraculous birth, like Gudea. For example, after conquering the East, Alexander was at once deified, and after his death a cult in his honor sprang up immediately among his subjects. Ptolemy carried the body of Alexander to Alexandria, where a temple was reared to his memory and sacrifices were offered to him. Alexander's image with the horns of the god Amon appears upon old coins. Even among ancient Jews similar ideas are found. Deification and worship of the kings were, of course, out of the question in their strictly monotheistic religion. Yet the king was regarded a "son of God" through Divine anointing and Yahweh's vicegerent upon earth. In several passages the kings and other representatives of Yahweh are called outright "god," a fact to which our Lord refers in John 10:34.

When this tendency to deify the rulers spread to the west, it underwent some modification. While in the Orient the king was regarded as a Divine incarnation sent from the gods to represent them, in Greece the ruler was believed to be a man who by heroic deeds exalted himself to become a god. It was hero-worship. In Rome this Emperor-Worship became increasingly popular, because it served the need of a unifying principle in this vast diversified empire. The Senate decreed that the adjective "divus," in distinction from "deus," should be prefixed to the names of Julius Cæsar, Augustus and others. The mode of worship usually consisted in burning incense be-

fore the bust of the emperor, standing in public places. This was considered a test of patriotism and loyalty and the refusal was punished as treason to the state. About this emperor-worship there soon gathered certain national hopes that were akin to the Jewish Messianic expectations. Gentiles as well as Jews were longing for a Divine deliverer who would put down evil, establish justice and inaugurate an era of prosperity. Vergil's famous prediction, found in his fourth Eclogue, clearly voices this hope.

Emperor-Worship and its underlying principle is important for our purpose for several reasons: (1) it throws light on several otherwise dark passages of the New Testament, such as Rev. 13:16; (2) it explains the reasons for the bloody persecutions of the Church until 311 A.D. and in subsequent ages. The Christians were charged with treason because they preached the kingship of Jesus (Acts 17:7) and refused to worship the Emperor (Rev. 13:9). (3) In its essence, this cult involves the deification of the state over against the rights of the individual conscience, the glorification of mere power and success, an idea which was cast into philosophical forms by Hegel and has been put in practice by certain types of statesmen in every country. (4) The principle underlying Emperor-Worship has survived in the idea that "patriotism" should be considered a kind of "super-religion" a state-religion, over and above a man's private religion, and that the essence of such patriotism is to consist in unquestioned submission to the will of the powers that be—"My country, right or wrong"; or worse still, individuals or groups insist, often with savage intolerance, that their private definition of patriotism is the only orthodox one. (5) Many ridiculous and blasphemous relics of King-worship are found to this day, even in America; titles, such as "majesty," "his grace"; or childish ceremonies, such as humiliating genuflections, kissing of hands of rulers, low bowing down before kings and nobles, medieval customs at coronations, wearing of grotesque garbs and foolish

processions, and all this in countries which profess to be "democratic," and even in times when crowns are wobbling and thrones are tottering. America should forbid its official representatives in foreign countries and especially their ladies to submit to this ridiculous firlefanz and hocuspocus.

But the most interesting form of Græco-Roman worship and one which left the deepest impression on the Church were the "Mystery Cults," or "Savior Religions." They originated in the Orient, the cradle of all great religions. The word *μυστήριον*, is derived either from *μυεῖν*, to initiate, or from *μύειν*, to shut the eyes or the mouth. The word thus stands for rites and ideas which must be closely guarded by those who possess them.

THE PRINCIPAL TYPES OF MYSTERY CULTS.

1. The *Eleusinian Mysteries*, named from the little place Eleusis near Athens, are the most famous of all. This cult is based on the beautiful Greek myth of Demeter and Persephone, so vividly described by Homer and reproduced by Schiller in his two ballads: "Klage der Ceres" and "Das Eleusische Fest." While gathering flowers in a meadow, so the myth runs, Persephone is carried off to the underworld by Pluto, the god of that region, to become his wife. Grief-stricken, Demeter, the mother of the lost, visits Eleusis. For nine days and nights she searches for the maiden without finding her. Being the "earth-mother" she, in deep resentment, refuses life to nature until her daughter is restored. The result is a compromise. Persephone spends the summer months with her mother on earth and during winter she lives in the underworld. The interpretation of this myth is evident. It portrays the processes of life in nature, which is dead in winter, and resumes life in spring. The worship of this mystery was taught by Demeter to a few chosen people to be perpetuated by them. The chief blessing promised to the initiated was participation in the triumph of the deity, i. e., victory over

death. This reminds one of Paul's explanation, in Rom. 6:1-12, of the mystical union between Christ and the believer. The initiation was very solemn, including diverse washings, a sacramental meal and pictorial representations. The fame of the Eleusinian mysteries was great. Even Roman emperors applied for initiation.

The *Dionysius* or *Bacchus* cult derives its name from a crude nature-god of the Thracians, the impersonation of the power of life in vegetation. In Greece he was worshipped as the god of the vine and the patron of agriculture. The manner of his worship was repulsive to sensitive men. Copious indulgence in wine resulted in beastly intoxication, known as the "Bacchic frenzy" and this condition was regarded as the "divine infilling," as being possessed of the god (*év-θεος*). The "happy" feeling resulting from intoxication was regarded as a foretaste of the bliss in the world to come.

Prominent among the cults from the Orient was that of *Cybele*, the mother-goddess, and *Attis* her consort. Attis dies, and the goddess mourns till he is restored to life. Here we have again the personification of the death of nature in winter and its revival in the spring. In the ritual, the initiated is assured that being one with the god, he will experience a similar triumph over death.

But for our present purpose, the most interesting mystery cult was *Mythraism*, because the myth on which it is based contains so many striking similarities to the life of Christ. The god *Abura* created *Anabita*, the goddess of fertility. The mediator between this god and man is *Mithra*, a mighty hero. He performs great deeds for mankind, casting out demons and saving the righteous from many troubles. After a farewell supper, celebrating the success of his redemptive labors, he ascended to heaven, whence he now ministers help to the faithful in their conflict with Satan and his hosts. When the faithful die *Mithra* receives their soul in glory. At the end of time *Mithra* will return to earth, raise the dead, preside at a

final judgment and bring the forces of evil to an end. According to Professor Harnack, the Mithra cult, in the third century, became the most powerful rival of Christianity, having its own redeemer, mediator, hierarchy, sacrifice, baptism, sacred meal—everything so like the Christian Church that the Church Fathers declared it to be a caricature of the Church, instigated by Satan to deceive the unwary.

The last stage in the development of these mystery cults were the various systems of *Gnosticism*, a subject highly interesting, but too large to be treated here.

COMMON FEATURES OF ALL MYSTERIES.

In principle all these mysteries and many others were alike. (1) All are in essence nature-worship, the deities being merely personifications of nature and its processes: the female deity representing the principle of fertility and the male god that of redemption and both symbolizing the sterility of nature in winter and the returning life in spring. (2) All claim to satisfy the deep craving in man for individual salvation which in its primitive expression is as old as the race. (3) All are "Savior-religions," that is, they offer help coming from outside of man, through a god, instead of "Attainment-Religions," according to which man himself must work out his own salvation, as Stoicism insisted. (4) All hold out as the chief blessing to the initiated a blessed immortality in the presence of the gods. (5) Most of these cults promised also present salvation, in the form of moral improvement. (6) All tried to meet man's craving for sociability. They were "brotherhoods," "lodges," "churches," if you please. Even boys were admitted, "on the piety of their fathers" an idea similar to that in 1 Cor. 7:14. (7) All prescribed an elaborate ritual. (8) All rites were calculated to work chiefly on the emotions, to impress rather than indoctrinate. (9) All claimed to effect a mystical union between the deity and the initiated, as the means of the promised salvation. (10) Connected with all of

312 *The Historical Background of the Apostolic Church.*

these mysteries, and nourished by traditional mythology, were numerous popular superstitions, some of which we meet with in the New Testament, such as oracles, divinations, exorcism, astrology, magic, etc.

INFLUENCE OF THE MYSTERIES UPON THE CHURCH.

Why is an adequate knowledge of these mystery cults of great value to a theologian? For various reasons: (1) A radical minority of specialists in the field of the new science of Comparative Religions, like Anderson, Jensen, Drew, Smith, etc., insist that Christianity in its inception was nothing more than one of the many mystery cults. The "Christos," they assert, was the mythical god, "Mary," the mother-goddess, "Jesus," the mediator; the gospel story of a dying and rising "Savior" is merely a Jewish adaptation of similar Oriental and Greek myths. The reason why this one cult survived is because its leaders understood how to absorb and use all the best cultural elements of the Græco-Roman world, and later, when Christianity was in danger of disintegration, the Reformation revived it by infusing into its blood the virile characteristics of the various branches of the Teutonic race. (For a reply see Vollmer, *The Modern Student's Life of Christ*, p. 348, and Case, *The Historicity of Jesus*). (2) These cults show that Christianity was neither the first nor the only religion which offered "salvation" in the first century. Neither the concept nor the name originated with the Church. (3) But the survival of Christianity in spite of these most tremendous conflicts, carried on with physical as well as intellectual attacks, proves conclusively that the Gospel is in a special sense the power of God unto salvation. (4) A knowledge of these cults proves that these mystery ideas did, indeed, influence the life and literature of the Apostolic Church, but only in a moderate degree. And this is not at all to her discredit, seeing that these cults contained many seeds of truth, and all truth comes from God. (See 1 Cor. 2:6, 7; Col. 2:21.) (5)

This observation assists the Bible student in answering the now burning question, as to what extent Christianity is original. (6) Church History shows that post-Apostolic Christianity was to a far greater extent influenced by the mystery cults than the Apostolic Church, for the reason that its environment and leaders were almost exclusively Greek and Roman. The semi-deification of Mary, for instance, is nothing more than an echo of the "god-mother" idea; the Catholic "saints" took the places of the Greek and Teuton gods; the mass is an adaptation of the "mystery-plays"; the sacraments became to be known as "mysteries," before the celebration of which the non-baptized, i. e., the "uninitiated" were dismissed ("missa," from which the word "Mass"—German, "Messe," is derived). These absorptions were atmospheric and unconscious. (7) These "Savior" religions furnished the preachers of the true "Savior religion" a most excellent opportunity of approach. (Acts 17:23.) It is a psychological truth confirmed by experience that religious progress is exceedingly difficult with minds which are tabula rasa. (8) Some of the elements of these mysteries have also survived, in an adapted form, in all secret societies of ancient and modern times and hence throw light on their understanding.

Recommended Literature.—Toy, *Introduction to the History of Religions*; Moore, *History of Religions*; Glover, *The Conflict of Religions in the Early Roman Empire*; Article in *Hasting's Dictionary of the Apostolic Church* on "Scriptures," II, p. 460; on "Synagogue," II, p. 541; on the Jewish Proselyting Movement, McGiffert, *Apostolic Age*, pp. 757-760; on "Judaism" in Kent, *Apostolic Age*, pp. 71-74; Angus, *Environment of Early Christianity*, p. 121 on the "Logos"; p. 133 on religion popularized; p. 136 on "Expectancy." On Emperor-Worship: *Hasting's Dictionary of the Apostolic Church*, I, p. 330; Angus, *Environment of Early Christianity*, pp. 85, 108, 134; Kent, *Apostolic Age*, pp. 16-17; Case, *Evolution*, p. 195; on the Mystery Religions: Sheldon, *The Mystery Religions and the New Testament*; Kennedy, *St. Paul and the Mystery Religions*; Jones, *The New Testament of the Twentieth Century*, pp. 720-761; *Hasting's Dictionary of the Apostolic Church*, II, pp. 49-62; *International Bible Encyclopedia*, III; Case, *Evolution of Early Christianity*, pp. 219, 284, 308, 334, 251 (on images), 331 (triumph of Christianity). Preaching among Pagans, Angus, *Environment*, p. 74; relation of art to religion and morals in Ruskin, "Lectures on Art," pp. 35-99. Loofs, *What is the Truth about Christianity*, p. 1.

V. SOCIAL AND MORAL CONDITIONS.

Society in the first century was greatly diversified both because of the mixture of nationalities and on account of wide differences between individuals as to their stations in life. There were four social classes, then as now. (1) Court life was almost wholly bad. The conduct of the emperors and most of the known "court-ladies" prove it. Old Roman simplicity had long ago made room to Oriental ideas, customs and adornments. (2) The class of the very rich comprised the office-holders, the landlords, and the military officers. These two classes combined to rule the people, whatever form of government obtained. (3) A fairly prosperous middle class, the "bourgeoisie." They were the traders, and peace, order and good roads encouraged commerce. This class was, however, small, for labor was considered a disgrace. Among the 1,200,000 inhabitants of Rome at Christ's time (Cic. De Off. 11, 12), there were scarcely 2,000 proprietors. (4) The largest class consisted of "free" laborers and slaves. Many of the latter were skilled workingmen, tradesmen and educators. The population of the entire Roman empire was 120 millions: Of these 40 millions were in Europe, 7 millions in Italy. Of the 120 millions, 60 millions were slaves, 40 millions tributaries and freedmen, and only 20 millions citizens. The army numbered 400,000, the navy 50,000. The number of slaves increased with Roman conquests. In Italy there were 1,300,000, and in the whole empire, 6,000,000. They were harshly treated, sometimes thrown into ponds to sweeten the meat of the fishes. A law was advocated that when a master was murdered all his slaves (as being considered under suspicion) should be put to death. Slaves were frequently liberated by their masters ("freedmen" or "Libertines," Acts 6:9). But most of these swelled the numbers of the dependent proletariat, who eked out a living with difficulty in the overcrowded centers of population. For survival of the fittest in society does not mean elimination but rather distress for the unfit, for they

remain with us. This class became so large and sometimes threatening that even the rulers concerned themselves with the situation, as a political measure, if not from humane motives. The slave insurrection led by Spartacus was one of the bloodiest. To prevent such clashes wealthy men and the government distributed corn, while the Cynic-Stoic preachers of morality tried to administer temporary relief by teaching men to endure hardship unflinching.

The *moral degradation* of the period when Christ lived has rarely been equalled and perhaps never exceeded in the annals of mankind. It may be judged from the following facts: (1) Paul's lurid picture of pagan wickedness in Rom. 1:18-32, which should not be regarded as a judgment from too lofty a moral standpoint, for all that he says is confirmed by pagan authors. (2) The excavated objects of Pompeii give us a faint glimpse of the horrible nature of the vice and crime at this period as a testimony to the fruit of heathenism. (3) The bare mention of the names of the emperors condemns a people which endured them. (4) The enormous wealth and coarse luxury, created a sense of insecurity and terror. Luxury passed all bounds and was too horrible for description. Among the rich, the disgusting practice was in vogue to prepare for dinner by taking an emetic. Emperor Vitellius, in less than eight months, spent in feasts, several millions. Games on the most lavish scale continued for weeks and months. (5) The very rites of religion were used to satisfy unnatural lust. (6) Family life among the Romans had once been a sacred thing, and for 520 years divorce had been unknown. But under the Empire marriage was regarded with disfavor. Women, says Seneca, married in order to be divorced and were divorced in order to marry. They counted the years, not by the Consuls, but by the number of their divorces. Children were regarded as a burden, and their education handed over to slaves. The exposure of infants and the practice of abortions was the general customs. Tacitus wrote his *Germania* as a "tendency

book," intended for the purpose of holding up before his educated, but demoralized, countrymen a people, uncivilized but possessing great virtues. In it he says of Rome: "Curruere et corrumpi saeculum est" (to corrupt and be corrupt is the spirit of the times). But it must be added that high ideals and persons of noble lives were not missing entirely.

Recommended Literature.—Angus, *Environment of Early Christianity*, pp. 37, 44, 50, 52, 55, 66; Breed, *Preparation of the World for Christianity*, pp. 375-475; Farrar, *Early Days of Christianity*, pp. 1-52.

VI. SOURCES FOR THE HISTORY OF THE APOSTOLIC CHURCH.

We may distinguish five groups of sources: (1) Jewish and Pagan sources. These are very meagre and of no special value. Josephus, *Ant.* 18.3.3; 18.5.2; 20.9.1; Tacitus, *Annals*, 15-44; Suetonius, *Nero*, 76. (2) The Apocryphical Gospels and Acts of Peter, St. Paul and Thekla, etc., may contain echoes of true traditions, but on the whole they are valueless, their true statements being derived from the canonical books. (3) The closing chapters of the canonical Gospels are important for our purpose only as they disclose the state of mind of the apostles just before the opening of their career. Otherwise they are fragmentary, condensed, while Mk. 16: 9-20 is a later addition. (4) The Epistles, especially those of Paul, are of decisive value as sources because much of their content is autobiographical. (5) Another primary source is the book of Acts. For a discussion of the authorship, the external and internal evidence, the sources, the special characteristics, purpose and plan of Acts we refer to works on New Testament Introduction, such as Adeney, and others. But one point does require attention here, namely, the long-sustained attack on the credibility and historicity of the book of Acts by the Tuebingen School of New Testament Criticism. The founder of this school was Ferdinand Christian Baur, born June 21, 1792, died December 2, 1860. He studied at the university

of Tuebingen and 1826 was appointed one of its theological professors. Some of his most important works are: *Paul the Apostle of Jesus Christ*, 2 vols., 1845; *Church History of the First Three Centuries*, 2 vols. (Both are accessible in English translations.) Some of his pupils were: Edward Zeller, Schwegler, Ritschl, Hilgenfeld. These and thousands of others in all lands, developed Baur's ideas. Baur worked out a very fascinating scheme of reconstruction of the Apostolic Age, based on Hegel's famous law of historical development, according to which all historical development must pass through three stages: thesis (positive statements); antithesis (opposition); and synthesis (harmony). Hegel's attempt was to show that the course of history is rational and necessary.¹ Applying this conception to the history of the primitive Church Baur held that the Christianity of the older Apostles consisted merely in the belief that Jesus was the Messiah of the Jews only. This was the "thesis." The learned and speculative Paul, by a logical deduction from the facts of the death and the resurrection of Christ, insisted on the freedom of the Church from Judaism and on the universality of Christianity. The older Apostles did not agree with him, while the Judaizers were obstinately hostile to him. This is the "antithesis." In the second century successful efforts were made to unite the two factions. This is the "Synthesis."—This philosophical scheme of historical reconstruction had a most important bearing on the authenticity of the New Testament writings. Baur's rule is this: (a) All books giving evidence of opposition and an "irreconcilable conflict" between Jewish and Gentile Christians are genuine, such as Revelation (a production of "Jewish narrowness" and opposition to Paul), I. and II. Cor., Gal. and Romans. The latter are the four incontestible and uncontested epistles of Paul. An epistle showing Paul in any other than a fighting mood, is from this very fact to be considered unauthentic. (b) All books showing that the Apos-

¹ See Vollmer, *The Inspirational Value of the Study of Church History*.

318 *The Historical Background of the Apostolic Church.*

tolie Church was harmonious are by this very mark proven to be post-apostolic. They are "tendency" books, religious fiction. This is especially true of the book of Acts whose unknown author, writing in the second century, is evidently anxious to make his readers believe that all was lovely and in perfect harmony between Peter and Paul and their respective followers, while as a matter of fact the primitive Church was rent in twain. In Chapters 1-12 of Acts he Paulinizes Peter and in Chapters 13-28 he Petrinizes Paul.—For over two generations this controversy kept the theological world in a turmoil, but today no New Testament scholar of note can be found sharing Baur's peculiar reconstruction ideas, brilliant as they seemed. Many permanent results, however, came from the tremendous research work of the Tuebingen School and its opponents, two of which are: saner ideas as to the inspiration of the Bible and a general acceptance of the view that the New Testament contains different types of teaching.

Recommended Literature.—Adeney, *New Testament Introductory*; Christlieb, *Modern Doubt and Christian Belief*, p. 504; Zenos, *Elements of Higher Criticism*, pp. 109, 234; Nash, *History of New Testament Criticism*, p. 120; Schaff-Herzog Enc. under "Baur" and "Tuebingen School"; Schaff, *History of the Apostolic Church*, p. 109; Vollmer, *The Inspirational Value of the Study of Church History*; Case, *Evolution of Early Christianity*, p. 99; *Hasting's Dictionary of the Apostolic Church*, p. 1, 15ff. on Acts and Apostolic Acts.

VII. THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE APOSTOLIC CHURCH.

The history of the Apostolic Church covers about seventy years, from the Ascension of Christ to the death of the Apostle John, A.D. 30-100. The whole period may be divided into four distinctly marked divisions:

1. *The Church in Judea.* From the Ascension of Christ to the Death of Stephen, A.D. 30-35.
2. *The Church in Transition.* From the Death of Stephen to Paul's First Missionary Journey, A.D. 35-48.
3. *The Church among the Gentiles.* From Paul's First Missionary Journey to his Death, A.D. 48-65.

4. *The Developing Church, throughout the World.* From Paul's Death to the Death of John, A.D. 65-100.

These as well as all other dates in Acts and throughout the Bible, are merely approximate. Only as to two events in Acts may we be reasonably certain as to the time of their occurrence, because the same events are also recorded in secular history and there they are dated. They serve us, therefore, as starting points for reckoning other events, both backwards and forwards. The one is the death of Herod Agrippa I., which according to calculations based on Josephus, Ant. 9. 8. 2. and 19. 5. 1. occurred after the Passover in 44 A.D., and the other is the accession of Festus to the procuratorship of Judea, which in all probability occurred in the summer of 60 A.D. Using these two fixed dates as a basis the following chronological scheme may be accepted as correct, though no two specialists agree on all its details.

Death of Jesus, Friday, April 7, A.D. 30.

Resurrection of Jesus, Sunday, April 9, A. D. 30.

Ascension, Thursday, May 18, A. D. 30.

Pentecost, Sunday, May 28, A. D. 30.

Conversion of Paul, A. D. 36.

Paul in Arabia and Jerusalem, A. D. 36-39.

Paul's Years of Silence, A. D. 39-45.

Paul's Missionary Work, A. D. 46-58.

Paul's Imprisonments and Death, A. D. 58-65.

Last Years of John, A. D. 70-100.

Recommended Literature.—Burton, *Records and Letters of the Apostolic Age*, p. 201; Purves, *Apostolic Age*, p. 305; Hasting's *Dictionary of the Apostolic Church*, I, p. 274 on "Dates."

VIII. SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY.

In addition to the literature given under the different chapters we recommend the following writings from the large mass of literature on this subject.

Hatch, *The Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages upon the Christian Church.*

320 *The Historical Background of the Apostolic Church.*

Scott, *Beginnings of the Church.*

Dobschütz, *Christian Life in the Primitive Church.*

Uhlhorn, *Conflict of Christianity with Heathenism.*

Tucker, *Life in the Roman World of Nero and St. Paul.*

"Teaching of the Twelve," in Ayer, *Source Book of Church History*, pp. 37-41.

DAYTON, OHIO.

II.

A REMARKABLE DISCOVERY IN THE NEW TESTAMENT RECORD.

JAMES CRAWFORD.

There are three incidents recorded in the New Testament in each of which a centurion conspicuously figures. Biblical scholars, and Christian people generally, have always regarded them as having no connection whatever. Therefore, it was quite natural for Archbishop Trench, an eminent Biblical scholar, to say, at the funeral of General Havelock, "that the three centurions spoken of in the New Testament were men of religious character." This generally accepted view has never been called in question.

That any one, at this late date in the history of the Church, should oppose this view will not only create surprise but predictions of the failure of such an attempt. Nevertheless, like Athanasius contra mundum, we contend that the three incidents are fragments of one of the most wonderful stories related in the New Testament, and intimately connected with each other; that there were not three centurions but only one, and further, that the story gives him, apart from the person of our Lord, a prominence in the Gospel history greater than the seemingly most prominent.

We courteously solicit a thoughtful, sympathetic interest in the effort we are about to make. Our motive is praiseworthy. In the interest of the truth we invite exacting criticism. Our promise is "to stick to the text, and to the most reasonable inferences and probabilities to be deduced therefrom and from the Gospel history."

Let us now study the first incident concerning

THE CENTURION OF CAPERNAUM.

In the Saviour's day Capernaum was a prominent city of Galilee, situated on the lake made memorable by various incidents of his ministry. It was to this place the Saviour fled after being driven from Nazareth, the town in which he had grown from infancy to manhood. It has the unique honor of being known as "his own city." During his abiding there he wrought many miracles. As a result of his ministry his fame spread throughout all the region round about.

St. Matthew tells us that a Roman centurion at Capernaum had a servant, dear to him, who had been stricken with palsy, and grievously tormented, a form of sickness which had evidently baffled the skill of both army and civilian physicians. It was natural that the centurion, considering the affection he had for his servant, and discouraged by the failures of medical skill, should turn with a hopeful feeling toward the wonderful miracle worker, who at that time was creating a sensation in that city as a healer of diseases.

His hopes, however, were mingled with misgivings. There were serious difficulties in his way. Even in this twentieth century of the Christian era we are familiar with the strong prejudices which separate Jews and Gentiles. The anti-Semitic feeling is at present creating dangerous troubles throughout Europe. Like *Banquo's ghost* it will not down. In the Saviour's day the anti-Gentile feeling was intensely bitter. The centurion had knowledge of this national feeling of enmity. Because of it he felt that his approach to Jesus was blocked.

St. Luke, in his narrative, gives us some details which illustrate the truth that it is sometimes possible to accomplish our purposes in indirect ways. He says: "And a certain centurion's servant, who was dear to him, was sick and ready to die. And when he heard of Jesus, he sent unto him the Elders of the Jews, beseeching him that he would come and heal his servant. And when they came to Jesus they besought him

instantly, saying that he was worthy for whom he should do this, for he loveth our nation. Then Jesus went with them. And when he was not far from the house, the centurion sent friends to him, saying, 'Lord, trouble not thyself, for I am a man not worthy that thou shouldst enter under my roof, wherefore neither thought I myself worthy to come unto thee, but say, in a word, and my servant shall be healed.' When Jesus heard these things, he marvelled at him, and turned him about, and said unto the people that followed him, 'I say unto you, I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel.'" Thereupon he healed his servant.

The narrative of St. Luke gives us a glimpse of the character of the centurion. It is said he loved the Jewish nation and had built for them a synagogue. We infer that he was broad minded, both politically and religiously, a soldier of some wealth, generous and kind. As we read the story we cannot but feel that he was a man of fine religious character.

In reading St. Matthew's narrative we are in the habit of making more account of what precedes the exclamation in regard to the centurion's faith than what follows it. That which we make so little account of is of tremendous importance for the right understanding of the narrative, and of the story in general. The exclamation in regard to the centurion's faith is followed by a remarkable prophecy: "And I say unto you that many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob in the Kingdom of Heaven, but the children of the Kingdom shall be cast out into outer darkness." This prophecy grew out of the centurion's faith. It would have been inconsistent, even mockery, for our Lord to make the prophecy and at the same time ignore the centurion's need in the fulfilment of it. He did not ignore him. On the other hand he finally made him the first fruits of its fulfilment. This centurion, as a consequence, was the first Gentile received into the Christian Church. And what about the servant whom he so dearly loved? He also was

received with him at the same time. But we are anticipating the conclusion of our claim.

Out of the narrative of St. Matthew's we get a prophecy. Time is needed for its fulfilment. We can afford to practise "patient waiting." Once upon a time Nicodemus, a ruler of the Jews, came to Jesus by night. They had a talk. Nothing seemed to come of it. Time was needed. Something did result from that talk. Nicodemus was one of the few who prepared the body of Jesus for burial. Was there no result for the centurion beyond the healing of the servant whom he loved? Here we leave him, for a time, with the couplet of the hymn ringing in our ears,

"God moves in a mysterious way,
His wonders to perform."

As the centurion of Capernaum disappears from view, for a season, we may suggest "some most reasonable inferences or probabilities" which we feel can readily be accepted as "certainties." From the moment of the healing of his servant he cherished a friendly feeling toward the Saviour. Of that there can be no doubt. The friendliness of his spirit would naturally inspire an interest in the Saviour's ministry and teachings. Again, we may reasonably infer that the Saviour would kindly remember the soldier whose faith in the power of his word had so greatly astonished him. These two inferences are reasonable.

Having parted with the centurion of Capernaum, covered with a veil of obscurity as to his subsequent history, let us now strive to find him re-appearing as

THE CENTURION AT THE CROSS.

At this point our textual data are meager. As a consequence we will not be surprised to hear the advocates of the accepted view predicting our failure, with the assertion that a comparison between the two centurions disproves our claim. They argue that the centurion of Capernaum was a very lovable

character, broad minded, humane, generous, courteous, a man possessing many of the admirable qualities of the famous soldier whom Archbishop Trench lauded in the sermon referred to. On the other hand, the centurion at the Cross stands there with stern mien, as the commander of a band of soldiers guarding against any attempt upon the part of the followers of Jesus to interfere with his crucifixion. The authorities of the Jewish Church had instigated the tragedy. Rome had consented unto it, and the centurion was stationed there to secure its enactment. In the light of this comparison we are not surprised that the accepted view of two distinct centurions should be so strongly and universally held. We are ready to concede that one of them was a friend of Jesus, and that the other seems to be an enemy. Nevertheless we persist in our claim, and fall back upon the text.

The incidents connected with the crucifixion are many and indescribable. You are familiar with the rage of the priests, elders and scribes, and with the delirium of the mob gathered about the Cross. Was there no one in that surging multitude either sympathetic or courageous enough to speak a friendly word in behalf of one who had brought help, hope and comfort to many hearts and homes in that land? Yes, there was one. At the moment when the sun was darkened, when the earth quaked, when bitter taunts were hushed by the terror which thrilled the multitude, one voice broke that fearfully impressive silence, saying:

"Truly this was the Son of God."

"This certainly was a righteous man."

The centurion at the Cross said: "Truly this was the Son of God." Let us dig into the depths of that saying. It was wrung from his heart and lips by marvellous phenomena witnessed that moment. He understood what he said, believed what he said. He spake with a feeling of certainty. God had spoken to him. He heard, believed and was comforted. We speak strongly, possibly beyond your comprehension. Wait, and you too shall know what he believes.

Now let us consider what he said, and the meaning of his saying. He is bearing testimony to the Sonship of Jesus. But it can be asserted that his testimony is worthless, from the fact that he is a heathen centurion. Let us examine this witness. We ask: "What do you mean when you say that Jesus is the Son of God?" "I do not know the meaning of it, and cannot therefore explain it." "Then why did you say it?" "I am simply repeating a claim which Jesus himself made during his ministry, and which his disciples believed." "But why do you so confidently assert it?" "Because I believe that the darkened sun and quaking earth are verifications of his claim." We may reasonably deduce from his examination that he had some knowledge of the teachings of Jesus.

We are now brought back to a consideration of the dispute in regard to one centurion being his friend and the other his enemy. Shall we say that the centurion at the Cross, who said: "Truly this was the Son of God!" was an enemy of Jesus? We ask the reader who is judging righteously, does he not show himself to be friendly toward Jesus?

May we not also concede his friendliness is proved by the other exclamation, "This certainly was a righteous man!" Consider. He stood in the midst of a howling multitude which had lost its head and heart, yet with the composure which men of his sort are expected to preserve at the cannon's mouth, said, "This certainly was a righteous man!" In the first exclamation he bears testimony to the teachings of Jesus. In the second to his character. At this point we again examine him. "Are you personally acquainted with this man?" "I have some knowledge of him." "Are you one of his followers?" "No, at least not yet." "Why do you say he is a righteous man?" "Because I believe his blessed ministrations prove it."

We argue that the two exclamations uttered at the Cross prove that he was a friend of Jesus, and conclude that both the centurions thus far named were his friends. However, there

still remains a perplexing thought which will suggest a doubt. Is it not a strain upon our credibility to believe that the centurion at the Cross should be a friend of Jesus. In considering the question we should remember that this man was a soldier. In the performance of military duty, in the language of Tennyson, "it was not for him to ask the reason why." It was for him to do, to dare to die if need be in obedience to the commands laid upon him. Whilst he had some knowledge of Jesus it was nevertheless scant. He was not a follower of Jesus. He never had the privilege of talking with him as Nicodemus had had. He had never had any intercourse with the disciples of Jesus. On the other hand, he was a soldier bound by a solemn oath to obey the commands laid upon him. This is our conclusion. As an official of the Roman Government he may seem to be an enemy, but from his exclamations he gave proof of his friendliness to Jesus.

We are now convinced that both the centurion of Capernaum and the centurion at the Cross were friends of Jesus. We go further and say that the seeming two are in fact one and the same person. We contend as a confident proof of our claim, that never, in the whole range of the Saviour's history, did he ever come, except in the case of the centurion of Capernaum, into any sort of contact, personal or official, with a soldier of the Roman army. The supposed three centurions are an impossibility. Stronger language than that cannot be used. We use it, and turn for proof to the record.

On a certain occasion in our Lord's ministry, he said to the Syrophenician woman who appealed to him for relief in behalf of her afflicted daughter, "I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel." Not only in the light of this saying, but also of the Scripture record, we can say that the earthly ministries of Jesus were confined strictly to the Jewish people. When he commissioned the twelve Apostles to go forth in his name, he said to them, "Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not, but go rather

to the lost sheep of the house of Israel." As for going to Roman soldiers whom every Jew hated, these disciples, so intensely loyal to their country, did not need to be warned. In the light therefore of the Saviour's command, as well of the prejudices of the disciples it is impossible to give such prominence in the Gospel history to three Roman soldiers.

In urging our claim that the centurion of Capernaum and the one at the Cross were one and the same person we should point out some inferences which confirm it. Did we not contend that the centurion of Capernaum would never forget the wonderful service which Jesus had rendered in the healing of his servant? There was more than remembrance. There was belief in the healing power even of the word of Jesus. Such a belief would create respect for his character, teachings and ministry. Beyond that he was not able to go. Being a Roman soldier he was shut out from all intercourse with Jesus and his disciples. However much he may have been interested in Jesus, or in his ministry, there was no apparent reciprocation of it on the part of the Saviour or his disciples. You have heard the story of the Wandering Jew. In our story we find a Wandering Heathen—a Wandering Centurion. The Jew wandered without hope. The heathen centurion wandered with a hope which he cherished in his heart. One day, a day least expected, joyfully greeted, long remembered afterwards, he stood at the Cross, and had a vision of the Son of God through the darkened sun and quaking earth. In the providence of God he was led to the Cross to witness the death of the One who had really restored his servant to life, and in that sight there was a kindling of tender memories of the past and the hope of salvation.

At this point let us briefly review some of the results of our claim. They are not many. We are sure that the centurion of Capernaum and the centurion at the Cross were one and the same; that both had some knowledge of the teachings and character of Jesus; that they were his friends, but not followers, nor was it possible for them to be included among the followers of Jesus.

But before we leave the centurion at the Cross we must anticipate two objections which may yet be urged against our claim. The first has reference to locality, the other to time. One centurion is represented at Capernaum, the other at Jerusalem. We have just come out of a great war. The movements of soldiers have become familiar to us. We have learned that they cannot tell to-day where they may be on the morrow. They are always under marching orders. They have no fixed habitation. As now so then. From Jewish history we learn that during the Passover Festival great multitudes of devout Jews gathered not only from all parts of the country but also from all parts of the world. The revolutionary spirit was always strong among them. They were easily aroused. At such times the small force usually stationed at Jerusalem needed to be strengthened. The company at Capernaum would naturally be directed to report to Jerusalem to meet the emergency.

The second objection has reference to the time of the two incidents. One was in the early part of our Lord's ministry, the other at the end of it. We are favored by this interval. We need time for the development of our story. We need time for the maturing of the grace of God in the lives of the centurion and his servant.

We are now prepared to take leave of the centurion at the Cross for a shorter interval than that which separated the healing of the servant and the tragedy of Calvary.

We now conclude our wonderful story with a reference to

CORNELIUS, THE CENTURION OF CÆSAREA.

We have reached remarkable stages in the history of a Roman soldier and of the founding of the Christian Church. Up to this time the centurion, regardless of any interest in or friendliness toward Christ, or desire on his part to become one of his followers (and we believe that he did so desire), had been shut out of the Kingdom of Grace which Christ came into the world to establish. He might have stretched forth his hand

as a token of his sympathy and interest in the cause of which Christ was the great leader but he would not have found any one to grasp it. Jesus himself no doubt remembered the soldier of wonderful faith, no doubt knew how easily he could have been won as a disciple but even he did not say "come with us and we will do thee good." In fact though he may have had such a desire he himself was not able to do so. But pause here for another thought. The Saviour was interested in him. He did desire him to become a follower. The only thing he could do was to awaken a hope in his heart that he would at the first chance have an opportunity of taking up his Cross. In that prophecy which he uttered he meant that the centurion and his servant should be the first fruits of its fulfilment. However, the centurion had little reason to hope when he saw the followers of Jesus with their backs to the wall to keep the Gentiles out of the Kingdom.

The data hitherto noted have been meager. That is expected. It could not be otherwise. There is, however, no lack as we draw toward the conclusion of our remarkable claim. In the Acts of the Apostles we have another incident in which a centurion figures. If there were three centurions, as is generally supposed, the New Testament is paying a splendid tribute of honor to the soldier manhood of the Roman army, and is giving to its officers a conspicuousness which throws the followers of Jesus in the shade. Of course we cannot concede such a thing, and must relieve the record of at least two of them to make it credible.

The centurion in the Acts is the only one whose name we know. It was Cornelius. He was the commander of a company of Italians. That is another particular. We have still another in the place of his residence. He was at that time living in Cæsarea. One was found at Capernaum, the other at Jerusalem, and the last one at Cæsarea. A soldier lives anywhere and everywhere, at times. It is reasonably probable that the centurion stationed for awhile at that place had been called to meet the emergency created by the Passover Festival at

Jerusalem. After that was past he would be called to the garrison headquarters at Cæsarea to wait for further orders. The late war has made us familiar with such shiftings of soldiers from one point to another.

The writer gives us a glimpse of the character of Cornelius. He was a devout man, and feared God. Did we not upon the basis of the record characterize the centurion of Capernaum as a man of fine religious character. Cornelius gave much alms to the people. Did we not say of the other that he was generous. The pay of soldiers in that long distant past was evidently small, as it also is to-day. When such soldiers build synagogues and give much alms it is evident that they have some wealth to fall back upon. Cornelius was a man of good repute among all the nations of the Jews. Does not St. Luke report the Elders of the Jews as saying that the Capernaum centurion was worthy of the favor desired, and that he loved the Jewish nation, and had built a synagogue for the Jews. Finally Cornelius was a just man, one who could judge men and things in a broad minded way. That was characteristic of the centurion of Capernaum. The resemblances between the two are many, strong and peculiar.

But let us go on with the story about Cornelius. It is said in the narrative, "He saw in a vision about the ninth hour of the day an angel of God coming unto him, and saying, 'Cornelius!' And he said, 'What is it, Lord?' And the angel said, 'Thy prayers and thine alms are come up for a memorial before God. Send men to Joppa, and call for one Simon, surnamed Peter; he lodgeth with one Simon, a tanner, whose house is by the seaside; he shall tell thee what to do.'"

Let us pause here. Melchizedec is spoken of as without father, mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days nor end of life. I am not going to explain what that means. I use the reference to say that when we take this incident apart from the other two we know nothing whatever of the antecedent history of this man, but on the other hand when we combine the incidents we get a very satisfactory and remark-

ably interesting history of his life. We need the story of the Acts to trace the connection with the other two incidents.

It is said that he was praying at the ninth hour. How did he pray, and what did he pray about? It is said of Cuvier, the great scientist, that if any bone, however small, of a long extinct animal were placed in his hand, he could, guided by it, construct a skeleton of the animal as it once roamed ancient jungles or forests. In like manner the prayer of Cornelius gives us the reason for the appearance of the angel and the meaning of the command to send men to Joppa. Cornelius was a Roman centurion, a heathen, known as a Gentile. Did he like the heathen in their prayers, bow down before idols of wood or stone? Did he find God in trees, plants, animals? Read the narrative and you will find that he was not praying in any such heathenish way.

If not, did he like Daniel, and the Jews generally, turn his face toward the Temple at Jerusalem and pray like a devout Jew? We think not. Though observing the Jewish hours of prayer, as did also the disciples of the Saviour, he neither prayed as a heathen, Jew or Christian! No, not even as a Christian, but rather as one who was longing and praying to become a Christian. For years he had cherished a hope in his heart which had been born through a prophecy uttered by Jesus when he healed his servant. That hope had been providentially brightened at the Cross through the darkened sun and quaking earth. Though the hope tarried he kept on praying that the door to the Kingdom of Christ might be opened to him. He was praying at the ninth hour about this deep heart longing. And in response to his prayer an angel came to him to bid him send men to Peter at Joppa "who shall tell thee words whereby thou and all thy house shall be saved." There was but one way for him to get into the Kingdom and that was to have a talk with Peter who would tell him what he ought to do.

I ask you to explain the antecedent life history of this man in order to account for his heart longing, the angelic appearance and the need of Peter's instruction. It cannot be explained except in the combination of the three incidents.

The mission of the messengers to Peter was an important one. He must choose responsible persons to convey the message. Whom did he send? A devout soldier that waited on him continually! This statement needs looking into. He was a devout soldier. His devoutness was evidently of the same kind as that of his commanding officer. If the devoutness of the centurion was linked with the hopes which he cherished we can assume that the servant's devoutness was linked with a similar hope. If the centurion had become attached to Jesus much more so would the servant be attached to him. When we come to meditate upon the words "that continually waited upon him," it is reasonably probable that the soldier who continually waited upon him was the same as the servant whom he so dearly loved. We feel that the blessing awaiting the centurion must also be shared by his servant and he needed to hear the same words which Peter would speak for his saving and of those who dwelt with him.

Whilst the messengers were on their way and near the end of their journey another wonderful happening is recorded. At the sixth hour Peter went upon the housetop to pray. Whilst there he fell into a trance and saw a sheet descending from heaven filled with four footed beasts, wild beasts, creeping things and fowls of the air. A voice was heard saying, "rise, Peter, kill and eat." Then Peter said, "I have never eaten anything that is unclean or common." And the voice said, "What God hath cleansed, call not thou common." Whilst Peter was wondering what the vision could mean, and whilst he wondered, the Spirit bade him go with the messengers who had now come, and he went with them to Cæsarea. Then followed an interview between Cornelius and Peter in the presence of the messengers. Explanations were made on both sides. Peter thereupon delivered a sermon to the assembled company, during which the Holy Ghost fell upon them, and they were baptized. When this happening was noised abroad among the followers of Jesus it created great excitement. Such a thing had never been known before. Never had there been a Gentile

received among the followers of Jesus. The excitement was calmed by Peter's announcing what had occurred through the manifestation of the angels to Cornelius and to Peter, and only upon the authority of Peter was Cornelius, his servant and others of his household received into the fellowship of the Christian Church. Here then at this point was fulfilled the prophecy of Jesus made at the time of the healing of the servant at Capernaum.

Beyond this incident there is no further reference either to the centurion or his servant. There is a tradition in the Christian Church which is reported in Dictionaries of the Bible that Cornelius was finally appointed Bishop of the diocese of Scamandria, a position for which he was eminently qualified.

Let us now briefly review and conclude the subject. Our claim was that the three centurions could be combined in one individual. That, after all, may be only a juggling with figures. It is possible to combine them and yet fail to perceive the significance of the remaining one. Above all things we must leave the record intact. It gives us three incidents, in each of which a centurion figures. The Scriptures, however, do not say anything about three centurions, and when we think of or talk about three it is due to the blindness of our minds. The Scriptural accounts are believable. The common interpretations of them are unbelievable. No! the problem before us is not really one of elimination but of addition to our knowledge—the addition of a new personality, a new character, a new individual, to the illustrious ones whose fame is everlasting through their association with the Saviour of the world. Theodore Roosevelt, a few years ago, discovered a river in South America which was not on the map. He placed it there. Here, indeed, is even a greater discovery, that of putting on the map of the sacred record a hitherto unknown individual whose development begins, continues and ends in the flaming elements of the miraculous. The miraculous conversion of Saul of Tarsus through which the Persecutor became a Saint brought him into the limelight of the New Testament, but

when he is compared with this new individual of whom we are speaking even the great Apostle to the Gentiles is overshadowed. Let us briefly contemplate him. As he moves unobserved through the New Testament history he stands apart from the Apostolic Twelve, from those who followed our Lord through his eventful ministry, from those who first formed the infant church. He had no part or lot in the history of Jesus. He is a Gentile, a Roman soldier, under the Jewish ban. Now let us look deeper. In the narratives of St. Matthew and St. Luke the Saviour heals his servant. That miracle of healing became a bond which bound the Saviour and the centurion with cords of affection. The curtain falls. Read on. Through the providence of God we find him afterwards at the Cross. To him the darkened heavens and the quaking earth are portents which inspire certainty of the Sonship of Jesus. Another wonderful miracle. The curtain falls upon him again. Then there came a time when the angels of God began their wonderful ministrings in answer to his fervent prayers. Send messengers to Joppa, to Peter; and to Peter the angels came. Go with the messengers to Cornelius. He is ripe for fellowship with Christian believers.

They meet. They talk together. Peter teaches, preaches. The Holy Ghost encompasses them. The centurion and his servant are received into the Church, the first ever received. The prophecy spoken at the healing of his servant is now fulfilled.

The three incidents are fragments of a story which illustrate the travail of a soul in its birth into the Kingdom of God—a travail typical in many ways of the spiritual experiences of the soul in passing from the kingdom of darkness into that of the light.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

III.

CHRISTIANITY AND FREEDOM.

H. A. GERDSEN.

On the barren, yet romantic, hillside overlooking the ancient city of Nazareth, stands an unpretentious building, which since 1867, has served as a Girls' Orphanage of the Church Missionary Society of England. Its location is beautiful, its surroundings inspiring and its philanthropic work ideal in placing before the Mohammedan world a daily illustration of the everlasting vitality of the Christian religion, with Love for its corner-stone and Truth as its foundation for human freedom. From the veranda of this institution the visitor sees spread out before him the plain of Esdraelon, so full of historic memories; Mt. Tabor, six miles across the valley; Nain, with its ruins, nine miles distant, and the hills of Gilboa, like giant sentinels guarding the southern confines of the plain. This panoramic view is most interesting and thought provoking, and while the observer stands in silent meditation reflecting on the historic significance of these ancient landmarks, he is suddenly aroused from his reveries by sweet-voiced choristers from the Orphanage singing:

"We are little Nazareth children
And our Father placed our home,
'Mid the olive groves and vineyards
Where the Saviour used to roam."

It is very significant that in the childhood home of the Founder of the Christian Religion, we have to-day a living illustration of the liberating and elevating power of Christianity when applied to childhood training, for modern Nazareth is the cleanest, most progressive and best regulated of all

the centers of population in Palestine. This fact is largely attributable to the influence of the Orphanage, which teaches the saving truths of the Gospel as found in Jesus Christ, and trains the girls to become thrifty wives and good mothers.

In our effort to grasp the significance of the subject under discussion, we dare not overlook the important part played by Nazareth and its environs upon the life, thought and ambition of Jesus, and as a result we have the all-pervading influence Christianity has exercised upon the "Rise and Growth of Human Freedom." Let us bear in mind that Nazareth is not to be regarded as an obscure village, but as a city, and that the sacred narrative affirms, "Jesus dwelt in a city called Nazareth." Dr. Selah Merrill directs special attention to this fact, and warmly opposes the idea that Nazareth and Galilee were really regarded with contempt by the people of Jerusalem. Whenever opprobrious sentiments were hurled at the inhabitants of northern Palestine, it was due either to jealousy or to the common theory that a prophet is not without honor save in his own country.

In this city, located in the mountainous district of Galilee, where the atmosphere was healthful and invigorating, and the people free from ecclesiasticism which dwarfed the liberties of Jerusalem, Jesus spent His days of physical, mental and spiritual development. Here He came in contact with the great trade caravans that passed through the city on their way from Babylon to Egypt, and His mental vision was enlarged while thoughts of human freedom swept through His soul as He studied the various races of freemen and slaves, merchants, artisans and sages that passed in review. Here, among the romantic hills and valleys, He was wont to roam in quest of knowledge. He studied the flora of hill and dale, the lilies of the field and the roses of Sharon; He familiarized Himself with the birds of the air and the animals in their native haunts; He observed the fleeting clouds and listened to the sighing winds; He breathed the pure mountain air and imbibed the spirit of freedom and patriotism so characteristic of His fellow

citizens. It is said that the patriotic spirit of these northern Hebrews was so pronounced that the Roman general Titus when desirous of arousing his own army to greater loyalty could find no better illustration than the 150,000 Galilean youths who laid down their lives willingly, in the last struggle with Rome, even as our own soldiers sacrificed their lives at Chateau Thierry and elsewhere, to make the world free from autocratic misrule, intolerance and oppression. It seems to me we cannot overemphasize the far-reaching liberalizing influence exerted upon Jesus by His environment, an influence later epitomized in His immortal platform, "The Sermon on the Mount," which was given to the world from an eminence whence inspiration came to Him from the snow-capped Hermon and the Sea of Galilee to the north; the romantic Jordan and Mt. Nebo to the east; the rugged hills of Samaria and the historic plain to the south and the blue Mediterranean to the west. Amid the inspiration of Galilee the Founder of Christianity evolved the high ideals of the Christian religion, embracing truth, fraternity, freedom, love, service and sacrifice as some of its chief foundation stones.

During its career of nearly nineteen centuries Christianity has always been characterized, either as the promulgator and custodian of liberty for the welfare and happiness of humanity, or else the holy religion has been deflected from its true course and fed largely on superstition, serfdom, hatred and selfishness. The former places before us the everlasting vitality of the Christian religion, while the latter introduces us to Ecclesiasticism.

I. DEFINITION.

In order to gain a clearer conception of the relation of Christianity to freedom, it may be well to bear in mind that Christianity does not claim to be a mere social revolution, or natural step in the march of human progress. It is a religion whose sources are not to be found within man's nature, but outside of it, in the saving revelation of God in Christ, and Jesus is thus the author and giver of eternal life which spreads itself

and is maintained, not by mechanical contrivance, but by the living Spirit of God entering into human history, and building on the basis of reconciliation a kingdom of God which is both human and divine, and which comes again and again, in wave of developing completion, until the will of God is done on earth as in heaven. This definition taken from the *Britannica*, while not unmindful of the human element entering into the development of Christianity, emphasizes its divine nature and origin, and places Christianity on a pedestal high above all other forms of religious culture, and endows it with attributes that cannot be eradicated, even if at times obscured, for the everlasting vitality in Christianity, like truth, when crushed to earth will rise again, as history abundantly verifies. Thus of the three great monotheistic religions, Judaism, Christianity and Mohammedanism, Christianity unquestionably stands before the world as the most intelligent, benevolent and liberating cultus known to mankind.

Freedom, on the other hand, while not a basic principle found solely in Christianity, is nevertheless so intimately associated with it that the two cannot be separated without doing violence to each other; for, Christianity without freedom is like a motor without energizing power, and freedom separated from Christianity may be compared to the existing propelling force which remains futile until assembled and put in action by the motor. Steam has existed since the beginning of time, so has electricity, but it remained for man to utilize and apply these forces through mechanical devices. Christianity is the motor, the truth, which the Master said shall make you free, and through this channel freedom has been assembled for its greatest efficiency and well-being to humanity. According to Lord Acton in his essay on freedom, liberty, next to religion, has been the motive of good deeds and the common pretext of crime, from the sowing of the seed at Athens, 2,460 years ago, until the ripened harvest was gathered by men of our race. It is the delicate fruit of a mature civilization; and scarcely a century has passed since nations, that knew the meaning of the

term, resolved to be free. In every age its progress has been beset by its natural enemies, by ignorance and superstition, by lust of conquest and by love of ease, by the strong man's craving for power, and the poor man's craving for food. In his search for a fuller definition of freedom, the essayist just quoted says, by it I mean the assurance that every man shall be protected in doing what he believes his duty against the influence of authority and majorities, customs and opinions. The state is competent to assign duties and draw the line between good and evil only in its immediate sphere. In ancient times the State absorbed authorities not its own, and intruded on the domain of personal freedom. In the Middle Ages it possessed too little authority and suffered others to intrude. Modern states face habitually into both excesses. The most certain test by which we judge whether a country is free, is the amount of security enjoyed by minorities.

With these definitions before us, we not only realize how true Christianity and genuine freedom are inseparably related to each other and work out everlasting results for the temporal and spiritual happiness of the human race, but we also gain a vision of the truth that what ancient races before the advent of Christ sought, and were unable to find, was given to the world after the coming of the great Teacher, through applied Christianity, and that in proportion to man's willingness to regulate his affairs, his business, his intercourse with man, his economic, social, political and religious life and views, in harmony with the foundation truths of Christianity, will he become a factor in establishing the greater liberty among men and nations, that eternal truth inherent in Christianity which alone will make the world free.

II. DEVELOPMENT OF CHRISTIANITY.

In the rise and growth of human freedom, Christianity has exercised a more potent influence than any other agency, yet its course has never been free from opposition, neither has it been permitted to demonstrate its virtue and vitality to its full

extent, nor has it during the centuries of its existence ever become a world-power based solely on the platform of its founder.

Born in obscurity and reared amid poverty, the mere handful of followers constituting the first Christian organization, numbered 120 persons on the day of Pentecost. At the end of the first century there were 500,000 adherents, and the tenth century claimed 50,000,000 followers of the despised Nazarine. Now, in the twentieth century of the Christian era, the most reliable statistics available place the membership of the Christian brotherhood throughout the world at 564,510,000, or approximately one third of the human race.

When Christianity began its career for world conquest, it was fortunate in entering upon its activity at a time singularly propitious, politically, socially and religiously, for the advent of a new universal and spiritual religion. The greater part of the then known world was included within one universal empire, the Roman. Everywhere, from the banks of the Euphrates to the shores of the Atlantic, and from the Rhine to the Nile, there was nothing but Rome. One scepter, one law, and largely one form of civilization and social life. National barriers were broken down and a freedom and facility of intercourse existed between the most distant regions and tribes hitherto unknown. The great Roman trunk-lines of traffic became the channels for conveying new ideas, and served as the veins and arteries for the infusion of a new life-blood into a waiting world. Then also by a strange providential overruling, beginning with the victories of Alexander the Great, and reaching downward to this time, the Grecian language, the richest and most expressive form of human speech, had become the spoken tongue of the cultured classes throughout the Roman realm, thus establishing a world language, which was used by the early Christian teachers in their missionary efforts and in the preservation of their literature, the New Testament, and later also in their philosophic thought, theological treatises and doctrinal pronouncements. This language, with its historic

backing and cultural value, became an asset for Christianity, the far-reaching worth of which cannot be over estimated. Then too, the dispersion of the Jews to various commercial centers, aided materially in making the synagogue the cradle of the Church. Christianity flourished from its inception, but not without violent and systematic persecution. Indeed ten pronounced efforts were made in the early centuries to annihilate it by destroying its literature and killing its members, ending in the well-known Diocletian persecution about 300 A.D., which rose to such terrific height that there remained but one alternative for the Christian, immediate apostacy or torture and death. The fires of martyrdom were blazing everywhere, except in Britain, Gaul and Spain, but Christianity was not blotted out, its everlasting vitality could not be crushed, and a new life was imparted through the very Roman power which for centuries had sought its destruction. Imperial Rome, the conqueror of the world, had long since passed the zenith of her glory, and under Constantine Christianity conquered.

This ambitious emperor, a combination of good and evil qualities, the founder of Constantinople, the murderer of his wife and son, was keen enough to realize what his predecessors had failed to see, namely, that amid the wreck of the decaying Roman Empire Christianity was the only growing vitalizing force to be reckoned with. Hence he summoned into his presence at the Council of Nice, 318 bishops of the Christian Church from Africa, Asia and Europe, and reverently addressing them as, "My Fathers," tells them he has called them together that they may teach him how to worship most acceptably the Man crucified on Golgotha. Three hundred years earlier the rabble in Jerusalem shouted: "Away with Him, we have no king but Cæsar," and now Imperial Cæsar hurls back the defiant reply: "I will have no King but Jesus!" Christianity has triumphed, and the Roman eagle is exchanged for the cross!

The accession of Constantine marks a new era in church history emphasizing the cleavage between the Eastern and Western Churches, later completed. Under his sway the persecuted

Christians were given freedom, both civil and religious. The Church fell heir to the old pagan temples and revenues; it was freed from taxation, and its representatives became a privileged class. This temporal prosperity sat enthroned during the fourth and fifth centuries, and the Church developed a ritual of great beauty and splendor. Her power increased. Her coffers were filled with voluntary offerings. Her bishops became personages of great distinction and even emperors stood in awe of them. Paganism abandoned its deities and Rome became nominally Christian. But this temporal glory was less healthful for the Church than the blood of martyrs, and the records are full of incidents connected with the ambition and rivalry of bishops, schisms, cruelty and bloodshed, and in time Rome became the official headquarters of the Pope, the supreme ruler of the Church. When in 800 Charlemagne conquered the enemies of Rome, he identified this triumph of Christianity with the triumph of his own cause, and after the coronation of Leo III, acknowledged the spiritual sovereignty of the Church. That was the beginning of the Holy Roman Empire, the conflict between Church and State, popes and emperors, for the sovereignty of Europe, lasting one thousand years.

III. ECCLESIASTICISM.

With the infusion of political aims into the Church, and thoughts of supremacy ever in view, together with the constant accretion of wealth and power, Christianity gradually drifted away from its original moorings. The spirit of Ecclesiasticism, with its good parts, but also untold evils, now swayed the Church, and as in the days of Christ, Jewish ecclesiasticism killed true spirituality and founded an autocracy of religious serfdom, so Christian ecclesiasticism lost sight of the fundamentals of Christianity and established the most rigid autocratic culture ever known to man. From the non-militant attitude of the early Church the war-spirit was stimulated. Freedom of thought on religious subjects was prohibited, and Christianity, the guardian of Truth and Liberty, failed to give its devotees either the whole truth or complete freedom.

Viewing the growth of Christian Ecclesiasticism quite impartially and through the mellowing influence of centuries that have passed, we must bear in mind that certain existing conditions of these early days naturally influenced the development of the Church. The Western, or Latin branch, had to contend with the customs, life, thought and philosophy established by Roman world rulership, and thus naturally cast her policy along the lines of least resistance. In order to vie with and surpass the splendor of heathen temples, magnificent basilicas were erected to impress the public with her power and stability. An elaborate ritual was substituted for the simple worship of Apostolic days, and, as Mosheim says, there was little difference in these days between the public worship of the Christians and that of the Greeks and Romans. In both there were splendid robes, mitres, tiaras, wax-tapers, crosiers, processions, lustrations, images, gold and silver vases. The western branch of the Church, grafted upon the old Roman institution developed in a Christianized form, and as the head of the Roman government also became the Pontifex Maximus, likewise the aim of the Latin Church was to place the Pope in supreme power as head of Church and State, a doctrine which gave rise to the great conflict between Church and State of the Middle Ages, between popes and emperors, and did not cease until the papal temporal power finally came to an end in 1870 when Napoleon III lost his empire and the Pope his protector.

Ecclesiasticism in its glory, was spectacular, it was awe inspiring, it was relentless, it was crafty, and by its sheer autocratic force made many conquests. When, *e. g.*, the German barbarians swept down from their Alpine heights to the very gates of Rome, the bishop was not frightened, but received their representatives in the Latern Palace and promptly converted them to his way of thinking. When Atilla with his Huns approached Rome as conqueror, he was met in opposition, not by an armed band, but by a simple priest who pleaded for mercy. The savage conqueror, unknown to pity, and with rich spoils within his grasp, was so awed by this reception that

he marched his men away without injuring the imperial city. When in 1073 Hildebrand became Pope Gregory VII, he not only boldly acclaimed the Church's independence of all outside control, and that he possessed divine authority to depose even emperors and kings, but under this assumption of supremacy promptly excommunicated Henry IV, who opposed him, and would not permit his royal majesty to enter into his pontifical presence until the humiliated emperor did penance for three days, standing barefooted in the court-yard at Canossa. When Hildebrand talked of the liberty of the Church, he meant only the emancipation of the clergy from all secular control, and not the greater freedom accruing from the application of Christian principles for the benefit of mankind. Yet the supreme power of the Church during the Middle Ages was instrumental in the Providence of God in working out certain problems. It built massive cathedrals as central rallying places, and to some extent unified religious thought and worship. It inaugurated spectacular crusades, for the liberation of the Holy Sepulchre from infidel hands, which although in themselves were failures, in their reflex action proved of liberating value to Europe, in so far as Eastern thought and customs were transferred to the West; it established fraternity and renewed ties between Christian nations, connected Europe with Asia and opened commercial avenues closed for many centuries. But after all when Ecclesiasticism became enthroned as a world power, it was not loved but feared, not liberating but enslaving, and thus despite the good locked up within its grasp, a lack of vision, except the vision for temporal power, turned Christianity largely out of its true course and made the Church of the Middle Ages an instrument of serfdom instead of freedom. Neither spiritual, intellectual nor social freedom could properly develop under its sway, and if the history of those may be trusted, then assuredly the status of affairs was most deplorable. Let me not be misunderstood in any statement made relative to the Latin Church in the Dark Ages, for I have no

desire whatever to say one word detrimental to that great Christian body which has kept Christianity alive in its own peculiar way from an early age to the present day. I admire the Roman Catholic Church for the many noble deeds she has accomplished, and stand in reverence before her inspiring ritual, her beautiful music, her exquisite art, her imposing architecture, her zeal, her devotion, her brilliant men and consecrated women. I have laid my hand in the hand of Pius X in audience with him, and received his Pontifical benediction, but after all, no impartial student or observer will deny that this organization, in all the centuries of its existence, some time greatly erred and kept Christian freedom, the Gospel of light, the revealed Word of God from the people. Her clergy were not always as cultured and liberal as to-day, neither were her men in authority always as benevolent and spiritual as the late Pius X. When Gregory the Great, in the sixth century, expressed himself freely, he called the Church an old shattered ship, admitting the waters on all sides, its timbers rotten and shaken by daily storms. Bishop Cornelius said at the Council of Trent, 1545, with what monstrosities of baseness, with what heap of filth, and with what moral pestilence are not both priests and people corrupted in the holy Church of God! Hallam says, Ignorance was one of the most common defects of the clergy. At the time of Charlemagne not one priest in a thousand in Spain, could address a common letter of salutation to another. In England, Alfred declared that he could not recollect a single priest south of the Thames, who at the time of his accession understood the ordinary prayers or could translate Latin into English. In Bohemia the archbishop of Prague was so illiterate that his opponents publicly lampooned him:

“Archbishop Spaeneck is the man
Who catches heretics as fast as he can;
He orders the Holy Bible to be burned
Before the art of reading he has learned.”

These random illustrations taken from different epochs of Church history tell in unmistakable language that something was going in the wrong direction, and that Christianity was not exerting a freedom-producing influence upon men and nations. Ignorance was the mother of vice and cruelty, and under its sway the irregularities and sins charged to Christianity flourished. But in a larger aspect it makes no difference whether in the name of Romanism 150,000 perished in thirty years as the result of the Inquisition, or whether in the days of Knox over 4,000 witches, men, women and children, were burned or drowned in Scotland in a comparatively short time. The men who tore Scotland free from Rome were the chief actors in this grim tragedy. Puritan bigotry was guilty of the latter while Roman intolerance was responsible for the former sin. It was, however, not Christianity but ecclesiasticism that dwarfed the Church and kept the world poor spiritually, intellectually and socially, and greatly retarded the growth of human freedom.

Ecclesiasticism when developed to its highest power bears the same relation to religion that Prussianism bears to statecraft, and the world of to-day is fully aware of the sinister influence of Prussianism.

IV. THE EVERLASTING VITALITY OF CHRISTIANITY.

It was reserved for the everlasting vitality inherent in Christianity, which like a murky stream, constantly struggled for self-purification, and in course of time, after many conflicts and defeats, many sorrows and trials of faith, dire persecutions and relentless wars, there emerged out of it, and through it, and by reason of it, a new earth wherein dwelt righteousness, to some extent at least. A new freedom of thought and speech, a new perspective, a new sense of eternal values and new standards of Christian conduct appeared. If time permitted it would be of interest to indicate the various counter influences exerted in behalf of a purified Christianity,

but only a few links in the chain of development can be given.

As early as the middle of the second century the idea of a universal or catholic Church was formulated, with ecclesiastical power invested in the clergy. Such a development was repugnant to many, and a movement known as Montanism arose, which maintained that the Holy Spirit, who since Christ's departure, had come to earth to carry on His work. Hence the Holy Spirit, and not the Apostles, must be considered as the successor of Christ, and the organs through which the Spirit spoke were not necessarily the clergy, but any man or woman might be chosen to declare the Spirit's message to the Churches. Irenæus and Tertullian were identified with this movement which, while crushed by the Church, did not fail to teach salutary lessons. The division of the Church into the Greek and Latin branches was another protest against errors that were creeping into Christianity. The Greek Church as the original stem, maintained a closer adherence to the Apostolic Church than the Latin, and rejected the Latin doctrine of a Vice Regent of Christ on earth, and the Filioque formula in the creed which taught the Holy Spirit proceeded from the Father and the Son, a dogma added to the Nicene Creed in the ninth century, but unacceptable to the Greek Church, because it strengthened the Latin theory of ecclesiastical organization.

About the time of Charlemagne's activities the Greek Church had gained considerable power in the East, and through her instrumentality opened the way for a religious movement destined to play a noble part in giving religious and civil freedom to the world, a contribution to the growth of human freedom apt to be overlooked by many historians, because of its apparent insignificance.

To-day the world stands amazed at the virile and aggressive part played by the Czecho-Slovak races, in their struggle for political freedom, and the establishing of a republic in the midst of European Bolshevism and revolutions. We admire

their spirit and pluck and wish them Godspeed in their efforts towards national independence. This very nation is descended from the ancient Czechs, a people of fine parts, from whom came the best literary, musical and artistic talent in Europe. A people with freedom-loving instincts and poetic temperament which urged them to reach out towards a higher spiritual unfolding; and, as some historians maintain, while the Teutonic and Celtic races were wrapped up in the mystic orgies of Druidism, the Czechs enjoyed a religious culture which vied with the polytheism of Greece in her balmy days. When these people were Latinized and spiritually sterilized, they appealed to the Greek Church for a deeper Christian culture, which was given them by two missionaries from Constantinople, Cyrill and Methodius by name, through whose efforts Bohemia and Moravia were placed under the influence of a more liberal Christianity with the Bible in the vernacular, and thus laid the foundation for the first formidable revolt against the established Church in 1400.

That form of intellectual activity known as Scholasticism, which flourished during the Middle Ages, and stood in strong contrast with that other institution Monasticism, was particularly aggressive during the twelfth century, and turned the minds of many away from religious serfdom into independent channels of thought. Protests against the Church and her teachings came from many parts of Christendom, and the latent vitality began to exert itself to a marked degree for the purging of the Church. The Albigenses, Waldenses and others fought vigorously for a less worldly and more spiritual form of Christianity, while somewhat later men like Wycliffe, Hus, Jerome of Prague and Savonarola, raised their voices in sharp protest against the superstitions and errors so pronounced in their day. Of the four reformers named, John Hus was the premier, and as the result of his teachings and martyr's death at Constance in 1415, the first formidable revolution, as Ridpath maintains, was launched against the Roman Church on

Bohemian and Moravian soil. A movement so effective that at the beginning of the German Reformation a complete religious organization was operative in Bohemia and Moravia with 400 parishes, 200,000 members, and the Bible, catechism and liturgy in the vernacular. If there had been no Hus and no Husite wars, says the translator of Sienkewicz's *Knights of the Cross*, there could have been no Luther or German Reformation in the sixteenth century. Luther recognized this fact when he said: "What the Bohemian and Moravian Brethren have done for their countrymen that we must do for the German people."

All these preliminary movements for the purifying of the Church finally led up to the greater and more powerful revolt against established ecclesiasticism which, under Zwingli, Luther and Calvin brought about a new religious and social order for human freedom. In these movements, none of which were faultless, we see the purifying power of Christianity, its inherent vitality, ever coming to the front for the purpose of self-preservation, and for the establishing of a greater freedom on earth, a religious and civil freedom, thus far only partially evolved.

RESULTS.

Although greatly hampered and often diverted into false channels, Christianity has worked out marvellous results for man's freedom. Its vitality, at times suppressed, has never been permanently overthrown, and has always come back with renewed power. Let us look at a few of the more prominent achievements that may clearly be attributed to Christianity as factors in the Divine scheme for human freedom.

I. SOCIAL FREEDOM.

A decided liberation achieved for the betterment of society came into force after a struggle of eighteen centuries, namely the abolition of slavery, the physical and social redemption of man.

Were it possible to live over again so brief a period as the last century, from 1800 to 1900, and make an analysis of the religious and social conditions at the beginning of these two centuries, there would then be unfolded a vivid picture of Christian progress and human freedom procured through the application of the principles taught by the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

Human serfdom was not considered at variance with the teachings of Christianity less than a hundred years ago, and we are amazed at the vastness of this system as it penetrates the Christian countries of Russia, Hungary, Prussia, Austria, Scotland, the British, French and Spanish colonies, North and South America. But the last century practically witnessed the abolition of this relic of barbarism, and to the United States and Great Britain must be given the credit of having opened the eyes of the world to this un-Christian practice. The liberation of enslaved humanity clearly stands before the world as a product of the Christian Religion, interpreted along the lines laid down by its Founder relative to the rights and prerogatives of society.

Another marked illustration of the material betterment of society as the result of Christian thought is the elevation of woman, the assigning of an honored place to her, and giving her that liberty of life, action and thought belonging to her as some of her inalienable rights. Of old, Roman law gave her no freedom, no voice in the government of the family. By marriage she lost all family rights, and her husband had the power of life or death over her. She was his slave. Jewish law taught the son to pray: "I thank Thee O Lord that Thou hast created me a man and not a woman." The Hebrew wife was subject to the whims and fancies of her husband. Confucius taught: "Ten daughters do not equal one son." Buddha taught: "That the only hope for a woman was that in her transmigration she might change from a woman into a man." Mohammed taught: "Women are whips of the devil. Trust

neither king, nor horse, nor woman." So throughout the ages neither religious culture nor civil law would grant woman that honored position, that freedom which belonged to her by divine right. Christianity granted her freedom, but it required a long time even for Christianity to do this. It was possible in some parts of the world as late as 1815 for a man if for some reason he became tired of his wife to expose her for sale at public auction and there for a nominal sum, less than the value of a cow or dog, have her transferred to a new master. Such inhumanities are no longer thinkable in Christian lands, and we rejoice that to-day woman's sphere and woman's position are advanced to a high Christian standard and that she is no longer the "weaker sex" but is growing stronger and more influential as the years roll by. The exigencies of the war have enlarged her freedom and given her an honored place not formerly enjoyed. Yet, we must bear in mind that it required centuries of Christian development before she was advanced to her proper sphere. Some one has pointed out three powerful causes which, under Christianity, operated to liberate woman. First, she became a factor in the Church; second, she was among the most heroic and blessed confessors who died at the stake or in the arena for the love of Christ, and third, the discipline of the Church finally protected the sanctity of marriage and recognized her as man's equal.

In the next place the humanitarian and altruistic principles of Christianity have had a salutary and liberating effect upon thought and society. One hundred years ago, if I may quote in part, the punitive laws were far more cruel than to-day. The counterfeiter, for example, is no longer punished by having both ears cropped and cheeks branded with hot irons, neither is the forger publicly flogged, nor are women whipped for receiving stolen goods and sold into slavery, nor are debtors cast into prison and culprits confined to vile and loathsome dungeons. Churches and schools are no longer

built by the sale of lottery tickets, as was the case even here in Lancaster, neither do church members give a barrel or two of rum for the spread of the Gospel, nor are intoxicants used at synods, marriages, births and funerals, as was formerly the case in many established Christian communities. Christianity has exercised a most wholesome liberating influence upon our social habits and customs, and if present indications may be trusted the coming liberating changes will be even more pronounced than anything the past has given us. This silent revolution which Christianity has wrought in the social world is clearly traced in the purer literature, the higher moral life and better public spirit now existing, and above all in the establishment of buildings for the needy, alms-houses, hospitals, orphanages, houses of refuge, homes for the aged and societies for the relief of the suffering and unfortunate among men.

II. INTELLECTUAL FREEDOM.

Few arguments are necessary to indicate that under the sway of Christianity a wave of intellectual freedom has gradually swept over the world. The truth which brings liberty was always reasserting itself, no matter how dark the ages. When Scholasticism gained the ascendancy it left its imprint upon every department of intellectual activity, and not only laid the foundations for universities, but paved the way for the development of our modern scientific attainments, and for the introduction of a purer form of Christianity. When active, Christianity is always thought provoking, and it is especially true that through the Protestant branch of the Church great intellectual freedom has been acquired. Dr. Newman has boldly asserted that all original discoveries in science, all original inventions in art, are the works of Christian men. Whatever is beneficent in every department of life may be traced directly to great Christian masters of thought, revelation and charity among mankind. It was the Christian Telemachus who was instrumental in abolishing

gladiatorial combats in Rome. It was the Christian Copernicus who gave us the true system of the stars. It was the Christian Gutenberg who gave to the world the art of printing, and the first book issued from the press was the Bible. It was the Christian Watt who gave to commerce steam as motive power. It was the Christian Morse who gave us the telegraph. It was the Christian Howard who inaugurated organized charity, and the Christian Wilberforce and Lincoln who abolished slavery. To-day Christian intellectual freedom stands in the very forefront of the great-achievements, and wherever its benign influence is given free course, there humanity is blessed.

III. RELIGIOUS FREEDOM.

It required centuries of time for the most ardent champions of Christianity to realize that the religion of Jesus Christ could not be confined to narrow man-made creeds, the products of councils and synods, but that its scope was world-wide, its aims universal and its purpose liberating. Millions of our race have sacrificed their lives in martyrdom because they failed to understand the Truth in the same light as those in authority; yet, out of all these distressing experiences Christianity is gradually coming forth victorious, divested of many non-essential creeds and customs which have hampered her real usefulness and retarded her mission as the great liberating force in the world.

One of the encouraging signs of the times, a result of the war, is found in the request made of the Peace Congress, to incorporate in the constitution of the League of Nations a provision guaranteeing religious liberty to all the peoples. A representative organization in England was the first to urge the incorporation of a clause assuring full religious freedom of worship for all creeds not antagonistic to public morals. In our land we have enjoyed the fullest religious liberty ever since the foundation of this government. In the British

empire and its colonies persecution for religion's sake has long been a thing of the past. Many of the continental countries, however, have had a bitter experience through the malevolent oppression of weak and defenseless religionists who differ from the religion of the state. Jews, Armenians and Greeks have suffered spoliation, deportment and death by thousands because of hostility among so-called religions. With the new freedom, old antagonisms would die out, and the Christians in Persia, Asia Minor and the Caucasus, and the Jews in Russia and Turkey, would no longer be in peril of massacres as they have been in the past. Religious freedom supported by the League of Nations would give Christianity a prestige never before enjoyed, and would be one of the strongest safeguards insuring peace among nations.

CONCLUSIONS.

Our subject under discussion is so vast in scope and so rich in interpretation that, in the time allotted, it is impossible to do more than touch, as it were the hem of the garment, and open the way for further discussion by the members of the Philosopfic Society; yet before closing it may be well to make casual reference to one of the most malignant opponents of Christian freedom now darkening the eastern horizon under the strange name: Bolshevism. A revolution which Lenine says must be international; it must pass over all political and racial frontiers and crush opposing economical and social ideas. The revolution cannot exist in isolation. In its own defense it must propagandize and convert, must incite and urge on the masses in all countries. The movement is threatening the world with disorder, discord and national destruction. It is an evil far greater than Prussianism or any other ism that has ever found place in society. It aims to overturn the established order, and strikes its poison fangs at the state, the home, the Church, society, freedom and every thing calculated to advance the happiness and stability of the human

race. Now is the time for Christianity to arise in all its power and majesty for the annihilation of this anti-Christian movement. Romanists and Protestants of every class, who have too long been at enmity with each other, should remember that their Master has said: "A house divided against itself must fall." The day has dawned for a united Christianity to march in solid phalanx against Bolshevism, the common foe of human liberties and the enemy of world progress. The day for creed-making and controversies over dogmas and ceremonial observances, is long since past and over. Let the Church of Jesus Christ pass through a new Pentecostal experience, gird on her Gospel armor, and as one mighty consecrated host of the Lord's Anointed go forward in combat against all the blatant foes arrayed against Christianity and the liberties of humanity.

LANCASTER, PA.

IV.

JOEL CHANDLER HARRIS, A FAITHFUL INTERPRETER OF THE NEGRO.

EDWIN W. BOWEN.

Joel Chandler Harris shares with Thomas Nelson Page the distinction of being the foremost of Southern writers who have admirably succeeded in interpreting the ante-bellum negro to the present generation and of preserving for future generations the character of the negro slave. These writers have both accomplished their self-imposed tasks well and have placed their readers under a lasting debt of gratitude. Page selected for portrayal the negro slave on the Virginia plantation in the days of the old regime. Harris selected for portrayal the negro slave on the Georgia plantation during that same period. Each of these authors has proved himself a truthful and accurate interpreter. Of course there was a difference between the Virginia plantation negro and the Georgia plantation negro, which the reader duly observes in the stories of Page and Harris. There is also a difference in the treatment of their theme by Page and Harris. They do not present the same phases of the negro character. For example, Harris pays a great deal more attention to folklore and makes the negro much more prominent in his pages than the Virginia author does. In Page's stories the slave owner and his family occupy the forefront of the picture and the negro slave is in the background. In Harris's stories this order is reversed, the negro being the chief figure in the picture and the master in the background. Page's purpose appears to have been to reproduce life on the Virginia plantation in ante-bellum days, the negro being a contributing element to this.

Harris's purpose seems to have been primarily to paint the negro in a folklore setting on the Georgia plantation in antebellum times, not much prominence being given to the white man.

It is to be noted, however, that neither Page nor Harris was the first of our American writers to see the possibilities of the negro in literature. Of course the negro had figured in fiction long before Harris or Page began to write. But the purpose of their predecessors was to introduce the negro to illustrate a theory or a practice of some sort, such as the demoralizing and debasing effect of slavery. It was with this moral end in view that Mrs. Harriet Beecher Stowe of course portrayed the negro in her famous novels, *Uncle Tom's Cabin* and *Dred*. These two novels—especially the former—served their purpose in arousing the American people to action and contributed in no small measure to the abolition of slavery. Yet Mrs. Stowe never possessed that intimate and thorough acquaintance with the negro on the Southern plantation that Harris or Page possessed. These Southern writers had a first-hand acquaintance with the negro, having known him intimately on the plantation where they themselves lived in the master's house, and where they saw him every day of the year. They therefore knew the negro in the various aspects of his character, as Mrs. Stowe did not. Furthermore, Harris and Page had no ulterior moral purpose in depicting the dreadful and iniquitous conditions of negro slavery, as Mrs. Stowe had. Their purpose in introducing the negro into their stories and in portraying his character was the mere entertainment and pleasure of their hosts of readers, as well as for the worthy end of preserving a type of the negro that existed in the days of slavery, but which type is now fast disappearing, if not already vanished.

Joel Chandler Harris uses the negro as a convenient medium for imparting much information on folklore quite common on the Georgia plantation. Indeed, students of folklore find in Harris's negro dialect stories a veritable treasure-trove and

are disposed to think that he created the famous character of *Uncle Remus* chiefly as a contribution to folklore. But of course such was not the case. It is true, however, that Harris was familiar with the animal stories, songs and myths which he had absorbed from association with the negro on the Georgia plantation and that an article on negro folklore which appeared in a Philadelphia magazine dealing with negro folklore first induced him to give literary form and expression to those legends, thus turning it to use and preserving it for all time.

In his own words he says:

"It was on this (Turnwold) and neighboring plantations that I became familiar with the curious myths and animal stories. . . . I absorbed the stories, songs and myths that I heard; but I had no idea of their literary value until, sometime in the seventies, *Lippincott's Magazine* printed an article on negro folklore containing rough outlines of some of the stories. This article gave me my cue, and the legends told by Uncle Remus are the result."

Joel Chandler Harris was born in the small town of Eatonton in central Georgia, on the eighth of December, 1848. It was said of him that, like his own hero Brer Rabbit, he was born and bred in a brier patch. That same section of middle Georgia produced two other prominent men of letters—Richard Malcolm Johnston and Sidney Lanier. Joe Harris, as he was called, was a poor boy. His mother who was a woman of strong character, though in straitened circumstances, kindled in her son an ambition for letters by reading to him Goldsmith's *Vicar of Wakefield*; and this book was held out to him as a model for his style of expression in his early formative period. He next became a reader of Scott, Lamb and Smollet. At a private school he attended in his early youth his teacher regarded him the best composition writer in his grade. At the age of fourteen young Harris left his mother's humble cottage for the plantation of a wealthy country gentleman, J. A. Turner, who needed a boy "to learn the printing business." This affluent planter published on his plantation a weekly

paper *The Countryman*, and it was in the office of this newspaper that young Harris learned the printing business and received his bent to journalism, which was to be his life work. In his book *On the Plantation* written years later Harris tells about his life in the Turner household. Here he enjoyed the advantages offered by a large library and here he had the opportunity of supplementing his meager education. Here, also, on the plantation young Harris acquired that thorough acquaintance with the negro which he portrays in the Uncle Remus stories. For he entered with zest into the life of the plantation negroes, engaging in their rabbit and possum hunts; and thus he acquired that rich fund of negro legend and song and folklore which he was afterwards to set forth in his charming manner in his well-known stories. Harris possessed a remarkable sympathy with all kinds of animals, wild as well as domestic; and he manifested this sympathy not only in his youth, but all through his life.

Harris had not been in the office of *The Countryman* very long before he ventured to write a few paragraphs, or a poem, which he contributed to its columns. But the fortunes of this newspaper varied with the fortunes of the Confederacy, and the little weekly finally suspended publication in May, 1866. Harris was now eighteen years old, and his apprenticeship was completed. From *The Countryman* he went to the *Macon Telegraph*, in the office of which paper he secured employment for a few months as typesetter. On leaving the *Macon Telegraph* he made his way to New Orleans and was engaged there as secretary to the editor of the *Crescent Monthly*. But before many moons this young rolling stone of journalism was back in Georgia again and had been engaged on the staff of the *Forsyth Advertiser*. In 1870 Harris accepted a call to be associate editor of the *Savannah Morning News*, which was quite a promotion for him. After a few years with this journal he was called to the staff of the very influential *Atlanta Constitution* as associate editor with Henry W. Grady and upon the untimely death of that talented knight of the South-

ern press Harris was promoted to the position of editor in chief. This post Harris filled with conspicuous success till his death in 1908. From the humble place of typesetter on a struggling country weekly therefore Joel Chandler Harris by rapid promotions rose to the prominent position of editor-in-chief of one of the most influential Southern journals. He was connected with the *Atlanta Constitution* from 1876 and saw thirty-two years of brilliant service before he died. It was during his early years with the *Atlanta Constitution* that Harris attained popular favor as a writer of negro dialect, and became famous throughout America as the author of Uncle Remus. These sketches of the plantation negro which appeared in book form in 1880 met with a most cordial reception. The reading public was simply charmed and delighted with their engaging style and quaint humor.

Joel Chandler Harris had of course published not a few of his sketches before he associated himself with the *Atlanta Constitution*. But these would never have achieved for their author more than a local reputation. It was in the columns of the *Atlanta Constitution* during the thirty-odd years of his connection with that influential journal that most of his writings first appeared. The files of that newspapers contain many of his best short stories, to say nothing of his editorials which were, for the most part, masterpieces of literary craftsmanship. Even his famous Uncle Remus stories first appeared in the columns of the *Atlanta Constitution* before they were collected and issued in book form in 1880.

The origin of Harris's Uncle Remus short stories is quite interesting and shows how Harris came, as if by accident, to be an author. Indeed, he has been described as an accidental author. In 1876 Sam Small left the staff of the *Atlanta Constitution* to become a member of the editorial staff of the *Herald*. Now, Sam Small had been contributing to the *Constitution* a series of sketches purporting to be written by an antebellum darkey who signed himself "Old Si." These sketches were humorous interviews upon the topics of the day and were

in the negro dialect of course. As they had proved a drawing card, the management of the *Constitution* desired especially to continue a similar series. So when Sam Small severed his connection with the *Constitution*, Joel Chandler Harris was reluctantly pressed into service to continue the series of humorous sketches which had proved such a hit with the public. Harris wrote under the *nom de plume* of "Jeems Robinson" at first, but later changed to "Uncle Remus" and represented him as a fictitious colored philosopher of Atlanta who was the author of certain character sketches and humorous songs and sayings in the negro dialect. In June, 1877, there appeared a brief whimsical sketch by "Uncle Remus" on "Politics and Collection Plates," closing with a stanza from his so-called "Revival Hymn." This song was at once recognized as a masterpiece. It was reprinted in newspapers far and wide throughout the United States and established Harris's reputation as the author of the best humorous song in the negro dialect. Having scored this marked success by his song, Uncle Remus continued to produce his character sketches and sayings till Harris had exhausted this vein of humor. Harris then collected the series he had written for several years and published them under the titles *Uncle Remus, his Songs and his Sayings*, *Nights with Uncle Remus*, *A Rainy Day with Uncle Remus*, and *Uncle Remus and his Friends*.

These books appealed to all classes of readers, adults as well as children. But primarily they were intended as juvenile books. They were read far and wide and translated into other tongues. The stories comprised in these volumes all deal with the same general theme and are in the dramatic form and in the negro dialect. Like the first book of the series, the other two represent the same old plantation negro telling his fascinating stories of animal life to his master's little boy and singing songs and preaching the doctrines of his race.

In *Uncle Remus, his Songs and his Sayings* the author depicts the old Georgia slave entertaining the little seven-year-old son of the master of the plantation in the following words, which form the introduction to the series:

"One evening recently the lady whom Uncle Remus calls 'Miss Sally' missed her little seven-year-old. Making search for him through the house and through the yard, she heard the sound of voices in the old man's cabin; and looking through the window, she saw the child sitting by Uncle Remus. His head rested against the old man's arm, and he was gazing with an expression of the most intense interest into the rough weather-beaten face that beamed so kindly on him."

Then the old slave proceeds to spin out those charming stories of adventure of the ingenious Brer Rabbit, that Ulysses of the fields as he has been called, who in a contest of wits with the fox, the bear, the wolf, the terrapin and the numerous other animals that figure in these folklore stories, outwits them each and all and proves himself the hero of the entire collection of these inimitable sketches.

It is noteworthy that Uncle Remus, who is the typical plantation negro, personifies the lower animals of the plantation, attributing to them an astonishing degree of intelligence and resourcefulness and investing them with more or less mysticism withal. Thus the animals in his stories are endowed with personality and a sentient nature and are represented as acting like a low order of human intelligences, such as the negro himself could comprehend. What is the explanation of this? Is it because on the plantation the negro in the days of slavery spent much of his time with the lower animals as companions and thus perhaps felt more closely in touch with them than with the white man who was so superior to him in every respect? Moreover, it does not appear why the rabbit above all others should have been selected by Uncle Remus for the distinction of being the shrewdest, the most astute and the most resourceful of the creatures on the plantation. Why is it that this timid little creature which is not noted for any special intelligence, or fleetness—though it is known to be rather fleet—is represented as outwitting and outdistancing all the other animals. He circumvents the cunning fox, outwits the wolf, is more than a match for the bear and proves himself easily

first in every contest of craftiness or endurance or even strength. Was it because the weak timid little rabbit appealed in a peculiar way to the sympathies of the negro as symbolic of his own humble and helpless condition in comparison with his master the owner of the plantation and for this reason was selected as the hero and champion, in revolt at the negro's own subordinate and insignificant place in society? But this is a question for the psychologist or the student of folklore to explain rather than for the critic.

Joel Chandler Harris employs the negro dialect with masterly success. He is conceded by all critics to be very faithful, accurate and true in his reproduction of the spoken lingo of the negro. No other Southern writer can hardly claim to have equaled him in this respect, and certainly none has surpassed him. Harris remarks in the preface to *Uncle Remus*, anent his use of the negro dialect: "If the language of Uncle Remus fails to give vivid hints of the really poetic imagination of the negro: if it fails to embody the quaint and homely humor which was his most prominent characteristic: if it does not suggest a certain picturesque sensitiveness,—a curious exaltation of mind and temperament not to be expressed in words,—then I have reproduced the form of dialect merely, and not the essence, and my attempt may be accounted a failure." But Joel Chandler Harris had diligently studied and studiously absorbed that picturesque lingo so as to be able to reproduce its characteristics—its quaint homely humor, its vivid sensitiveness and its striking picturesqueness—with fidelity and accuracy. He expresses it therefore in its classic purity as it was heard upon the lips of the Southern plantation negro in the days of slavery. In this he gives proof of his rare skill and art as a writer. He is very happy therefore in his faithful reproduction of the language of Uncle Remus.

Harris is equally happy in his portrayal of the character of the plantation negro with its poetical temperament, its sly humor, its simple philosophy and its quaint originality. Nor was this by any means an easy and simple task he essayed. For

the plantation negro was a character of considerable subtlety, with a mercurial disposition and subject to extremes of emotion. One day he was in the slough of despond and the next day on the heights of the delectable mountains. But these extremes of emotion are reflected much more clearly in the negro's songs and sayings than in his actions. In his songs particularly he manifests his poetic temperament, his picturesque imagination and his quaint, homely humor, as he does not of course in his actions, since for generations his nature has been repressed in subjection and servitude. But Harris, who knows him thoroughly as if to the manner born, delineates his character with admirable fidelity and accuracy, sketching him in his varying moods and with his passing whims. Furthermore, Harris deserves all the more praise in that he portrays the negro in the dramatic form which is the most difficult of all the forms of expression he could have chosen for his self-imposed task.

Besides the Uncle Remus stories Harris wrote quite a number dealing with the plantation negro, as for example, *Daddy Jake the Runaway* and *Free Joe and Other Georgian Sketches* and others still dealing with folklore, such as *Little Mr. Thimblefinger and his Queer Country* and *Mr. Rabbit at Home*. These last two are intended to be juvenile books and of them *Mr. Rabbit at Home* is a sequel to *Little Mr. Thimblefinger and his Queer Country*. It may be said of these books, however, that while they are very entertaining, they are not up to the standard of the Uncle Remus stories. Those dealing with the plantation negro particularly are very much in the manner of the inimitable Uncle Remus series. They all exhibit that charm of style and manner of which Harris was a master and show that as a raconteur he has few superiors. Still his fame is perfectly secure without them, inasmuch as we have the Uncle Remus stories which are sufficient of themselves to make their author's name immortal.

It is now time to consider Harris's other short stories that do not treat of the negro or folklore. Some of these are in-

cluded in the above-mentioned volume entitled *Free Joe and Other Georgian Sketches*. In addition to this collection Harris published *Balaam and his Master* (which collection includes several negro stories), *Tales of the Home Folk in Peace and War*, *Sister Jane, her Friends and Acquaintances*, *Chronicles of Aunt Minervy Ann*, etc. The last are sketches, not short stories. The volume *Free Joe and Other Georgian Sketches* contains besides the title sketch some excellent short stories such as "Little Compton," which is a story based on an incident in the Civil War, "Trouble on Lost Mountain," "Aunt Fountain's Prisoner" and "Azalea." This last is the longest story of the collection, but not the best. "Little Compton" would probably be voted the best, though the stories are all good. "Balaam and his Master" is an extremely interesting short story illustrating the fidelity of a negro slave to his master amid very trying circumstances. Besides this little story the volume contains "A Conscript's Christmas," "Ananias," "Mom Bi," "Where's Duncan?" and "the Old Bascom Place"—all of them stories of fascinating interest and of fine workmanship. "Where's Duncan?" is a dreadful story of an old negro slave mother who kills her master because he had sold her son and shipped him to parts unknown. It is of the nature of a revenge story and is quite horrible, somewhat after the manner of Poe. "The Old Bascom Place," on the contrary, is a charming, though pathetic, story of sentiment, having the Civil War for its background. The story tells how old Judge Bascom had to sell his fine estate to a wealthy Northern man because of the loss of his fortune through the war and his beautiful daughter to teach a country school for a living and how the Northern man falls in love with the daughter of the old Judge, she thus becomes mistress of her father's domain, the old judge loses his mind, goes back to his former domain he had sold and takes up his abode there under the delusion it was still his and finally dies there.

Tales of the Home Folk in Peace and War contains about a dozen engaging stories, all with a Georgia background, but of

unequal merit. To mention a few of these in detail, "The Colonel's Nigger Dog" is a sketch of an old runaway slave; "A Run of Luck" is a good gambling story; "A Baby in the Siege," "The Baby's Fortune" and "The Baby's Christmas" form a brief series of sketches setting forth the various vicissitudes and hardships resulting from an unhappy marriage that was opposed by the girl's parents. By the agency of an old negress, a faithful slave of the family, the unfortunate young wife is conducted back to the home of her parents who at length relent, the reconciliation being effected through the recognition of the little child's claim upon their sympathy and affection. This sketch is of the nature of a surprise—a type of story so popular with O. Henry. In his early volume of short stories entitled *Mingo and Other Sketches*, Harris has some very good stories in addition to those setting forth the relation between the slaves and their master on the old plantation under the old regime. But space does not permit detail mention of all of our author's collections of short stories and tales.

Among Harris's works of fiction there is one capital story which was indebted to the trying reconstruction period for its inspiration. This piece of fiction is entitled *Gabriel Toliver* and is of the proportions of a novel, not a short story. It is the best of his more ambitious attempts at fiction and is really a very creditable performance. It is presumably a true picture of those terrible times in Georgia during the era of reconstruction. Harris, no doubt, was well qualified and thoroughly competent to write upon this theme, for he lived through that terrible period of reconstruction in the South and saw abundant evidence of all its horror and fearfulness as well as its humiliation.

Harris somewhere referred to himself as "an uncultured Georgia cracker." In doing so he mentioned a type of character that he attempted to delineate in his tales and sketches. He certainly had abundant opportunity to be perfectly acquainted with this familiar Georgia type, and in his stories he describes this type as one who had lived among the "crack-

ers" and knew them thoroughly. He presents a vivid portrayal of those poor whites who socially are not much elevated above the negro. Thomas Nelson Page undertook to describe some of the poor whites of Virginia and succeeded admirably. But Harris has perhaps succeeded even more admirably in describing the poor whites of Georgia,—“the crackers” and the “moonshiners.”

It is, however, in the portrayal of the old plantation negro that Harris has attained his greatest success. It is here that he exhibits his marvelous knowledge of folklore, especially in his animal stories, and his skill as a raconteur. He dearly loved a story and was a charming story-teller. He used his gift as a story-teller in exhibiting his marvelous knowledge of the folklore of the negro—a primitive people in their American environment—and the result is the creation of a new character in literature, Uncle Remus. Of Harris's many tales in the Uncle Remus series probably the “Wonderful Tar Baby Story” is the finest, as it certainly is the most famous. Here in a contest of cunning with a sly fox, the meek little rabbit is represented as proving himself easily the champion. It is the incongruous attitude of the rabbit in this story that the author relies upon to impart to it its humor and charm. Indeed, it is, in general, the incongruity of Harris's animal stories that give them their universal appeal, their perennial quality of entertainment and amusement. Uncle Remus is Harris's happiest and most distinctive creation in fiction, and this figure is real and original, abounding in humor, with and homespun philosophy. This character will doubtless remain its author's greatest contribution to American literature.

Harris knew the plantation negro under the old régime probably more intimately and more thoroughly than any other writer who has attempted to describe it. He certainly portrays that character more fully and more cleverly than any other American author. Thomas Nelson Page generously acknowledges Harris's supremacy in this province. He declared that “no one who has ever written has known one tenth

part about the negro that Mr. Harris knows," and this statement is probably no mere hyperbole. For as one reads Harris's negro stories, one becomes more and more convinced that he painted the negro in a manner more true to life than any other writer who has written about that picturesque character of antebellum times that has now all but disappeared.

Joel Chandler Harris by his fiction has enriched American literature. He has proved himself a faithful and sympathetic interpreter of the negro and thus has rendered a distinct service to the world of letters. He reproduces the life of the old plantation days, depicting both the light and the dark side of negro slavery, its comic and its tragic features. He shows himself a genuine humorist in his fiction and his humor is always diffused with a sweet sympathy that renders it all the more charming. His stories abound with wit and pathos and a deep moral purpose underlies all his work. As a writer he is perfectly simple, wholesome and natural, and his stories possess a charm for all his readers, young and old alike.

RANDOLPH-MACON COLLEGE,
ASHLAND, VIRGINIA.

V.

FRANKLIN AND MARSHALL COLLEGE
AND THE WAR.¹

FRANK K. HOFFMAN.

There was founded here an institution of learning with an unusual mission. Chief among its purposes as set forth in the preamble to the act of its incorporation was that "The citizens of this State, of German extraction, desire to increase and perpetuate the blessings derived to them from the possession of a free government; to train up a succession of youth to fully understand, zealously practice and strenuously defend the republican form of government." That was the cornerstone upon which this institution was built. To-day the descendants of the founders meet at a commencement season to submit to all the world that they have kept the faith.

At a time when we had supposed the advancing civilization afforded security to enlightened nations came the world's great war. Although initiative and penetrating minds had upon occasion discerned the need and counselled the advantage of adequate preparation free people everywhere reacting always to the freedom about them and repugnant to the very thoughts of war interpreted all nations in terms of their own freedom, and but dismissed the voice of scented danger as the outcry of the opportunist, or the harbinger of evil.

And when an Austrian prince fell at the hand of an assassin, it was, of course, assumed that an appeal to orderly processes of law, evolved through generations of upward struggle, would but reveal that justice was the order of the day. Indeed, the nation

¹ The address delivered at the commencement of Franklin and Marshall College, at Lancaster, Pa., on Wednesday, June 18, 1919, by Frank K. Hoffman, Esq. of New York.

of the transgressor employed the customary and established procedure. She would herself enforce the law, or, the demands upon her assuming national proportions, she would submit the controversy to an international tribunal. What did happen? Did Austria present her complaint in any organized tribunal? Instead she chose to make unwarranted demands, crystallized, as they were, into an ultimatum unparalleled in modern history, and meaning little else for Serbia than the surrender of her sovereignty itself.

Aroused to the necessities of the hour, the statesmen of Europe labored to arrest the impending crisis. But like the rushing of a mighty river the awful danger swept on. Consternation filled the air! Everywhere, as if struck dumb by the enormity of approaching events, men seemed to stand aghast.

Then, high above the heat and awful discord, there sounded forth in clarion tones the spirit of the Anglo-Saxon race. And, that memorable proposal of Sir Edward Grey, which will live as long as men love law and revere the rule of reason, that to preserve the peace of Europe the nations meet in common council to vindicate the right, but gave utterance to the spontaneous aspirations of the race that had stood at Runnymede.

With equipoise of feeling, and with conflicting suspicions of European diplomatic intrigue, America in her traditional aloofness had stood apart, and from afar had viewed events. But we had inherited the Anglo-Saxon law and its traditions. Upon these our institutions of government had been built, our rules of conduct had been formed, and our national life had been maintained. And when England put forth the great proposal to which I referred, America knew instinctively that a just and proper procedure had been evoked. And when the German government, with excuse as puerile as it was inconsistent, refused the offer of lawful adjustment, America, astonished at such refusal assessed the situation for herself. No questions of national honor were at stake. No demands had been made upon Austria. Serbia was the defendant. Why had Germany refused? At once America with her accustomed

directness of effort, her alertness of mind and her keenness of discernment saw clear as the noonday sun, that in concert the Central Empires had chosen to disregard the principles of law.

Thereafter although the American Government might remain neutral, and might commend neutrality at heart, great portions of her people could not and did not so remain. Remembering our past, and conscious that those who stood for law had not failed to speak and had not ceased to bear aloft the torch of justice there went forth in them our solemn pride, and to their cause we gave forthwith our sympathy and our hope.

When in long grey lines, and in violation of solemn treaty, that mighty war machine turned south through Belgium, the earth itself seemed fairly to recoil. Then came the thrilling story. Belgium had thrown herself across its path. And Cæsar's words about her remained now to be glorified. Though small of size, she too had kept the faith. With valiant effort, with willing sacrifice, with endurance unto death, she stood at her Thermopylæ. Who now can doubt but that Liege made possible the turning at the Marne?

And there at the Marne, on that fateful September day, driven back by numbers overwhelming, was England's pitiful few. There staggering beneath the blows of violent assault was France. Before them stood the mightiest army ever assembled at the hand of man. But arms and men alone could not defeat them. In them was that mysterious power that bids men but dare and overcome. There arising from the loins of her despair was born anew the spirit of the French. And with each sabre that she drew went forth a flaming spirit. There men seemed possessed of double strength. There was France reclaimed with all the glorious memories of her past. Europe there was saved.

And through the long and weary months and years that followed there were those among us not unmindful of England's searching navy, or of her Grand Fleet that in ceaseless straining effort endured the rigors of the North Sea, and like a grip-

ping vise held helpless the boasted German navy. And well we know how Briton's sons, from out of every part of her far-flung domain, rushed to the common cause and gave the lie to those who said they would desert her.

Nor did we pass unnoticed the growing battle fame of France. Verdun to us was not alone the rock upon which fell fierce blows; we knew it stood for the incarnate might of France, fighting, ever fighting, against tremendous odds, defeated a dozen times, yet eternally undefeated.

Nor did we fail to draw unto ourselves the agony of the Belgians and the French, enduring every torment that frightfulness could devise to break the will of an unconquerable people. And there were those among us who did not hesitate to raise our voice, and wield our pen in condemnation of the wrong.

When in disregard of human rights and with barbaric glee these pirates of the deep destroyed our citizens, the indignation of our people knew no bounds. But our government, content to stand on legal rights, accepted their assurance and their solemn pledge. But their pledge in honor made to us meant nothing more to them than the adjournment of nefarious schemes until the time to act was more expedient.

Through crafty hands, they set intrigue upon us and somehow hoped to profit by our supposed credulity. And all the while our people bore their lot in patience.

We sought no war, we were a peaceful people and our statesmen well contended that as visioned by the fathers, and proclaimed by Washington himself, our mission lay not in Europe, but upon the western hemisphere, and every means save sacrifice of honor itself was employed to save us from the conflict.

But when with brazen effrontery they denied our very right to sail the sea, America arose; yet even then, we stayed our arms and hoped they would commit no overt act. Alas! our hope was vain. War came to us inevitably.

Sometimes we hear transcendent motives placed upon our entrance in the war, and there are those who state and even in

high places, that we went to war for purposes one likes to hear. But I for one am well content to leave that to the judgment of impartial history. But this I know—they first made war on us, and to keep our honor spotless, and to preserve our rights left us no choice. Indeed, no nation worthy of her self-respect could have avoided war.

It had at times been prophesied that a republic could not successfully wage on foreign soil a great offensive war. Our special contribution to political development had been in our erecting a well-defined sphere in which in times of peace the individual was assured freedom of action among his fellows and immunity from interference by his government itself, and there were those who doubted our ability to bind ourselves together, and to command our strength.

Well may it be said that with the war we found ourselves. From every group and section there poured forth unity of purpose and eagerness to serve. Men and women, old and young, stood to the colors like a united family. Men of affairs gladly gave themselves unto their government. Men of great wealth, and those of humble rank, worked side by side. And women not content to stand aside found ample ways to serve the cause. And everywhere throughout the land the only contest seemed to be in striving best to serve and in helping others to endure.

Men may differ in their estimate of the value to his country of our President. But for myself, I hold we are too near him, and events, to judge. Leave that to posterity and a just appraisal is assured. But I can find no greater contribution that he made to the winning of the conflict than when, taking at its flood the aroused emotions of our people, he pressed to its passage the first conscription bill. At once our might was tangible. And had the enemy but eyes to see then in the writing of that act, it must have read its doom.

With war upon her, the nation looked to her colleges and universities for leadership and she did not look in vain. With all that they were, and with all that they possessed, they stood

firm behind her purpose. Franklin and Marshall College promptly adjusted her session that her students might hasten into camps. In proportion to her numbers, few, if any colleges, contributed more candidates to officers' training camps or had more candidates in these successfully qualify. Becoming a part of the military organism, the college itself was converted into a student army training corps, and where academic aims had been pursued, her efforts were now directed to things of military value.

In her determined alumni she realized her hopes. Her brilliant and constructive Black was chief of all the army engineers. Her resourceful Styer commanded the first American contingent in the Far East. Her great organizing executive Rose was in charge of purchase of supplies. Her energetic Apple became the head of gas instruction in his training camp. Her able administrator Davis was an adjutant upon the staff of General Pershing. Her alert and forceful Chaplain Bassler roused our camp here and abroad by his stirring words. Her active Little led forth the infantry from Maryland. Her skilled and sacrificing Stahr organized and took from here an ambulance company. These few officers I mention. If time permitted I could name a hundred others. Everywhere her followers enlisted in the service or as civilians found useful work to do. And those obliged to stay at home envied those who went.

Among her men there was a noticeable desire for service overseas. They sought no easy tasks. They were too content to bear the hardships of campaigns. Danger and death itself held for them no fear. They only sought the privilege to stand and serve.

Our allies knew our program was sufficient to achieve victory if our men in time could but reach them and become available for the battle line. But as the months passed and only a few divisions were in Europe when the enemy launched his great offensive, the opinion was oft expressed that perhaps

America was too late and hope was almost gone. Even with our increased troop movements the morale did not much revive, for what could untrained troops be expected to accomplish.

But when on that memorable day the news was flashed that raw American troops had administered a crushing defeat to mass German attack, our allies found already at their side the reality of America's military strength. If unseasoned troops could fight like that, then many divisions were at once available, and the hope of victory and the will to conquer burned again with an unquenchable fire.

And among those at Chateau Thierry and Belleau Wood were our own men. They were in that characteristic sweep at St. Mihiel. They were at Cambrai. They stood in defense of the channel ports. They were in the irresistible advance in that inferno of the Argonne. When we think of them there and of their willing sacrifice and suffering, of their heroism and their unflinching spirit in offensive action we are indeed filled with solemn emotions. We pay them our high and lasting tribute. Their deeds live after them. They have earned the eternal gratitude of their college and their country. The mere mention of such names in action as Stahr, Apple, Rupp, Heller, Gerhart, Schaeffer, Kieffer and others, is but to call the college roll itself upon the field of battle.

I could name many of her sons who, at the sacrifice of their affairs and without hope or expectation of reward, rendered valued service to the Government. I could tell of her leaders in the huts of the Young Men's Christian Association. I could indicate her workers in the Red Cross and in varied war activities. I could recount her men in the service decorated for bravery, cited for valor, and promoted for distinguished achievements. I could enumerate statistics that might fill anyone with pride. I prefer to merely say that in their lives our men but exemplified the teaching they received here. When from that obscure village of Pennsylvania, nestled at the foot of the South Mountain, there came to this college that

profound and respected system of philosophy did it not instil into her sons the truth that being emancipated they were to achieve their purest freedom, and to attain their highest ideals when they were actuated by supreme duty.

But there are those who will not return. Some lie now beneath the soil of France. To them their alma mater bows in reverence. Their names are indelibly written not only upon tablets but within her heart as well. High upon the pages of immortal glory for her their names are written. And forever they remain within these walls, the inspiration of all who love heroic deeds in duty done.

Of those who gave their lives Harnish, a young and conscientious student, did not live to realize his aim in active warfare, but died while yet here in the student army training corps.

Long, skilled in medicine and giving great promise as a surgeon, served upon the surgical staff of the War Demonstration Hospital, and died from influenza during the epidemic of that disease.

E. R. Sykes, attached to an ammunition train, contracted pneumonia while on board ship and died soon after his arrival in England. The hospital authorities state of him: "He was a good soldier, never complaining and always smiling."

Welker, oldest of our men who died in the service, was an officer in the medical corps. He did heroic work directly back of the firing line, and was undaunted in his zeal to aid his fallen men when he was stricken.

Zeller, trained in aviation in England at Oxford University, a fearless and daring pilot of the famous 20th Squadron of the British aerial service, met his death in combat. A member of his squadron, describing him, says: "I can say that he died indeed a brave man and very gallant officer."

Grove, filling with skill a position in a regimental intelligence squadron, was killed while making observations at the front. One of his professors here has said that in his death

the college lost one of the finest young men who had crossed its campus in many a year.

Weller, descended from a line of soldiers, proved his worth as a regimental athletic director. He commanded the company that captured Chouy, where he was fatally wounded. His superior officer reported of him that no braver man than he had left his life on the battlefield.

Eschbach, yet a junior in college, was in action with a hospital corps at Cantigny, where the fierce battle was raging in the drive upon the channel ports. He was killed while carrying a wounded soldier to an aid station.

Truxal, killed in action on the Arras front, did all that duty could demand of him. His commanding officer states he could have saved himself at the sacrifice of his men, but chose to sacrifice himself in an effort to save them.

Kemp, splendid scholar of literary attainments, and an excellent soldier, promoted to the rank of captain for heroic and valorous service, fell while leading his command. He fell mortally wounded, but staggering to his feet before losing consciousness called to his men: "Boys, show them what you are made of."

Shelly, of the Signal Corps, one of the most earnest and painstaking students that ever entered this or any college, unostentatious but firm in character and every inch a man, fell in the Argonne while performing his duty with characteristic faithfulness.

P. J. Sykes, well known figure on the college campus during his student days, admired and respected by all for his ability and fidelity, fighting with his company at Chateau Thierry and Belleau Wood, cited for bravery, and recommended for promotion by General Pershing, never lived to learn of that promotion, but fell at the head of his company. On the day he fell he remarked "The war is won and I can die happy."

Worthington, killed in action, typical American soldier and

college man, scion of our best, twice awarded the Croix de Guerre and specially commended by Marshal Petain, was one of the youngest and certainly one of the bravest captains in the American army. If the definition of a hero as one who does every day's work faithfully and well be correct, then by his sterling character, his loyalty and devotion to duty, his love of country and of college, he has left an heritage of heroism that no son of the college can fail to emulate.

Thus have they died. And though saddened at the separation, our tears are for the living rather than for the dead. For the desolate fire-side, bereft of its loved ones, for those who sorrow at their going, we may weep, but not for our heroic dead. While their sun went down in the early morning of their lives they still live for us and bid us think of life, not death, of life to which they lent the passion and the glory of spring. And we feel that somehow, in the great mystery, they must know their alma mater cherishes their memory.

When we think of the tragedy of it all we are not surprised that there are those who even wish to deny their German ancestry. When one beholds the German nation drunk with egotism and having the effrontery to insult the decent opinion of mankind by proclaiming the brutal doctrine of the biological necessity of war, and by proclaiming the cowardly doctrine that it is not only the right but the duty of the strong to overcome the weak, we are indeed appalled. And when we are brought face to face with the ugly frightfulness of the most diabolical political and national philosophy that has appeared on the earth, the inhumanity of it all makes any one revolt.

Well may the intellect itself of man but blush when German universities through eminent professors and led by Harnack himself attempt officially to justify the rape of Belgium. For where in all the world of learning has scholarship sunk so low?

Though foul deeds meet their commendation, they sometimes seek to justify themselves through what they term their virtuous

inner feeling, which usually they say we do not understand. But where has any people but themselves, or any conscience but their own proposed to justify brutality through so-called inner feeling and thus conveniently escaped the consequences of their own violation and their conscious and deliberate acts by seeking refuge in this comfortable Utopia of the mind. Students of ethics may disregard them. They are of value chiefly to the student of psychology, if not, indeed, psychiatry.

And it was even a part of the modern theory of the German Government that people everywhere could be frightened into such attitude of mind as she might desire. But when dangers fell upon that government and fell upon its ruler, who had loudly professed great valor, we were not surprised to see that glittering monarch desert his own cause and slink away to seek his personal safety. What a contrast between him and that heroic figure, the mighty Cardinal Mercier, who, when destruction well nigh overtook his people, yet remained steadfast and who through all the perils and the dangers that befell him, stood like some towering and majestic oak against which the storms might break, but which tempests only seemed to send its roots down deeper and to make its structure the more secure.

But let none of us confuse our ancestry with the Germany we now behold. We are not of them and they are not of us. Let no one be ashamed to spring from any race that could produce a Luther or a Schiller. As our states here grew half slave, half free, so has German heritage grown half slave, half free. Those people never knew our Germany. Theirs is the Germany of Bismarck, and Treitschke; ours was the Germany of another day. Theirs was the Germany of material achievements; our was the Germany of poetry and song. Their Germany stands for might; our Germany stood for freedom. Theirs is the Germany of the reptile press; our was the Germany of the idealist. Their Germany strangled liberty. Our Germany brought to America the spirit of the Reformation.

Arrogant still and repenting not their crimes, but lamenting only their failure to achieve the purpose for which their crimes

were committed, they have traveled their chosen path and stand to-day before the bar of eternal justice to receive their fate. Proud of our heritage have we not remained true to our better selves?

Of all the blunders made by the government at Berlin none was more stupid than in supposing that somehow throughout the world those with German forebears would rally to its standards. In this it shut its eyes to all that history had taught. Well might it have seen that Germans settled in this land to happily assure themselves escape from political and religious restraint.

And let no one say our fathers founded here a German institution or cultivated here the German life. Their only thought of Germany in planting here their college was to impart to our own national life all the noblest and the best that they might draw from her.

No one knew this better than that master intellect, our own illustrious Nevin. Speaking here at the celebration of the union of the colleges more than half a century ago, he crystallized our purpose when he said, "A living communion will be maintained with the literature and science, philosophy and religion of Germany." And then, and with what now seems to have been almost prophetic vision he added: "The life of Germany as such can never and should never become the life of any part of these United States."

While we have watched in the universities of Germany like some monstrous and poisonous flower, their new doctrine, their miasma of Weltpolitik come to life and flourish, will it not be admitted that following the inspiration of Nevin we, as loyal Americans have contributed no small share in the formation of our nation's ideals, the strengthening of its character and the development of its thought. And have not our men in their living and in their dying but verified the truth of Nevin's characteristic utterance made in that memorable address from which I have already quoted when in speaking of us he said, "The mountains are not more full of buried wealth than the spirit of our people."

Has this German nation that we now behold any contribution to offer to the world? Despicable though she is, we yet must frankly admit that in her slavish atmosphere she developed government as an instrumentality of social welfare on a scale never before or elsewhere seen. While others had been awakening to the conviction that ignorance, inefficiency, unemployment, vagabondage and misery ought, if possible, to be prevented, she said they could be prevented, and, although becoming sordid, she did prevent them and by preventing them she created indeed a collective efficiency almost superhuman. And let us be aware that our own great internal political question of the future is whether a way can be found to conserve liberty, promote progress and yet profit by competent government with enlarged social and economic functions.

In realizing our privileges and responsibilities arising from the war, and in perfecting any international engagements or League of Nations while maintaining a high purpose and a resolute courage we must at all times exhibit the clear thinking that rests upon the solid foundation of sound judgment. We must see to it that nothing be done to place in jeopardy the institutions of government bequeathed to us and that every proper thing be done to aid and assist men and nations everywhere. This challenges at once the attention of our colleges and universities, and demands the wisest, the noblest and the best that is in us all.

No matter whether we approve or disapprove the conduct or the methods of any man or group of men this great problem must rise above all personal considerations, and never must it in any way be tainted by the partisan motives of any political group. To prostitute it thus would be to offer insult to the very dead and the cause for which they died. And senators must not mistake the silence of our people as an indication of their indifference. They will presently discover it is required of them that they approach this lofty problem and seek its solution in the light of our day, but only in the spirit of the fathers of the Republic.

To those leaving the college to-day I would but add they are going forth into a world with opportunities at every hand, and into a world mellowed by common sacrifice and suffering. No previous time has been so favorable within which to achieve material, moral or spiritual success. Few men succeed because they are naturally brilliant. Success is due usually to persistence, determination and healthy ambition. Any man can cultivate these qualities. Well has it been said, and I would have you remember this always, "The greatest of faults is to be conscious of none." Be true to the teaching you have received here and you will remain on the highway to attainments. May you be ever ready at the call of your alma mater and at the call of your country.

And may this nation ever remain true to the principles upon which it was founded. May it ever stand as a refuge and an inspiration to upward-struggling people. May it in liberty and freedom perpetually shine as a beacon light upon the horizon of justice and righteousness. May the colleges and the universities of the land be ever ready to spring to her defense. And our prayer for our own beloved college here is that as she was happily founded and is cherished and maintained from generation, may she ever remain worthy of her past, striving always for the advancement of the public good and the glory of Almighty God.

NEW YORK.

VI.

THE NEW LIFE.¹

RICHARD ROBERTS.

"Jesus answered and said unto him, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born anew, he cannot see the kingdom of God" (St. John 3:3). To this passage, I would add another from a very different source. There is no greater intellect among living men to-day than that of Bertrand Russell, the English philosopher. He is not a Christian; I suppose he would call himself an agnostic. In his latest book, *Proposed Roads to Freedom* (p. 187), this passage occurs: "A life lived in this spirit—the spirit that aims at creating rather than possessing—has a certain fundamental happiness, of which it cannot be wholly robbed by adverse circumstances. This is the way of life recommended in the Gospels, and by all the great teachers of the world. Those who have found it are freed from the tyranny of fear, since what they value most in their lives is not at the mercy of outside power. If all men could summon up the courage and the vision to live in this way in spite of obstacles and discouragement, there would be no need for the regeneration of the world to begin by political and economic reform: all that is needed in the way of reform would come automatically, without resistance, owing to the moral regeneration of individuals."

That is to say,—if men were truly Christian, lived the spiritual life, the new world of which we dream and of which we speak so much nowadays would come of itself. Mr. Russell

¹ The annual sermon delivered at the Commencement Exercises of the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church, at Lancaster, Pa., on May 7, 1919, by the Reverend Richard Roberts, D.D., pastor of the Church of the Pilgrims, Brooklyn, N. Y.

is however sceptical whether it can come in this way. But the New Testament isn't. And Jesus is not. And we may also say that it is the task committed to the Christian Church to quicken this life in all men in the confidence that it can, and that at last it will be done. And if I venture on so great a theme to-day, it is because I believe that we who are in the Christian ministry need nothing so much as to recover the sense that the whole business of our preaching and our living among men is to spread the contagion of this life in the spirit in which alone is the hope of a renewed world.

If you and I could come to the New Testament with a virgin mind, we should make two great discoveries: the first being the surprising discovery that the chief subject matter of the Book is life. I say that this would be a surprising discovery because most of us have the idea that the New Testament is chiefly concerned with religion. Some of us indeed have the still more astonishing illusion that it is primarily a theological work. Others who have more right to speak because they still read the New Testament (and I confess I do not find many of that kind about) will tell you that the fundamental interest of the New Testament is with what is called *salvation*. It is true that the New Testament has much to say about salvation; but it does not conceive of it as an end, but rather as a means to an end; and that end is life. And if the New Testament deals with religion, it is simply because religion is inseparable from the kind of life of which it speaks. That life is religion; and it is the only religion that matters.

But this life, what is it? Plainly not the physical life which we share with the brutes that perish, though that is indeed a high and holy thing. Nor is it what we may call the intellectual life, the life of thought; nor is it the moral life, the life of trying to be and to do good. Nor is it the æsthetic life, the life of worshipping and creating beauty. It is something which the New Testament calls by varying names: eternal life, life in the spirit, life in Christ, life more abundant, and the like. It is a sort of superlife. You will remember that the philos-

opher Nietzsche taught that it was possible to develop out of our present manhood, a type of man which should be as much superior to us common men and women of to-day as we are superior to the higher animals. This higher type is the superman. The New Testament does not concern itself with future supermen; but does indeed concern itself very deeply that common living men to-day should enter this superlife, a life which is as high above our common life as our common human life is high above that of the brutes that perish. Moreover it says very plainly and very insistently that this is the real life for which we were made and that we are no better than dead until we have entered into it; but also that we may enter into it whensoever we will.

The second discovery we should make is that the characteristic personal message of the New Testament is the call to make a new start. You must, it tells us, begin all over again. You must repent, you must be turned, converted; you must become as little children; you must be raised from the dead; you must be redeemed from captivity; you must be born again. That is, you must go back to the very beginning and make a fresh start. And the net effect of this new start is to bring you into the superlife.

Now, the New Testament does not tell us very much or indeed anything about the process by which this new start is to be effected. It has been left to us moderns to investigate the psychology of the process of conversion; but it does not appear that we have yet come upon the efficient causes of it. When Jesus said to Nicodemus that he must be born anew, Nicodemus recognized that there was a miracle involved in the process somewhere; but he could not locate it. But he need not have troubled himself about it. Nor need we. That after all is God's affair and not ours. Let a man have the will to be converted, and God looks after the rest. And that it seems to me is all there is to be said about it.

And I venture to think that it is the central business of the preacher to-day to go to men and to say something of this kind

to them. "Here is the life to which you are called; you may enter into it when you will. The power which will quicken you, will bring you through the gateway of the new birth is still available. Your end of the affair is to provide the conditions; and God does the rest. And the conditions may be summed up in a single word. God is only waiting for your readiness, your willingness to do for you this tremendous thing."

But this will not of course be enough. We shall have to go on to show them how tremendous a thing it is. We are living in the midst of a ruined world and are talking a great deal about building it up again. That blessed word "reconstruction" is all about us; and a thousand schemes and plans are in the air. We are discussing the League of Nations, industrial democracy and much beside; but all the time we are supposing that we can create a new kind of world without also creating a new kind of man. And not all all paper plans and the energy we spend in discussing them will carry us a single step forward if men are going to live the old life in the old way. What the world needs is not so much a new plan as a new life, not so much new schemes as new men. The only reconstruction that will stand the racket of time is regeneration. I do not say we are not to do these other things; of course we are. But it does not matter how well-meaning our plans may be, if men are still going to live on by the old scale of values, to pursue money, power and other will-o-the-wisps of wordly wisdom, we shall just reproduce the old world, with its old sins and its old miseries, its old tragedy and its old pain. Never was there a day when the New Testament message was so relevant, or the task of the preacher so clear or the need of it more terrific than to-day.

What then are we to tell men concerning this life? In the main, I think, three things:

1. It is a life of vision. "Except," said Jesus, "a man be born anew, he cannot see" . . . which implies that when a man is born anew, he does see something . . . something he has

never seen before. Observe it is one thing he sees,— the kingdom of God. It is a vision of a unity, or if you will, of a universe; of all things in one thing, everything in a single thing.

It is a vision of life as a whole. As things are, we see it and live it by compartments. We departmentalize it, into business and pleasure and religion and so forth; and we make of it no more than an intricate and patternless patchwork. We say that this region is sacred and that secular, this spiritual and that temporal; we even think we can draw the frontier line between these territories. But as a matter of fact that frontier line exists only in our own fancy. Peter, you remember, thought he could draw it, until he saw a vision of the Kingdom and out of the vision a voice thundered a word which blotted out the frontier line for ever: *Call nothing common or unclean*. And what we have through the new birth is this power to see the whole of life as one single sanctity and all the world holy ground. We shall see the Shekinah gleaming on the breast of every common man and every common bush aflame with God.

You will remember, however, that it was about Jesus that Nicodemus wanted to know; and Jesus told him about the Kingdom. From which it is fair to infer that Jesus meant that he could only be known when he is seen in his own proper setting. Nicodemus was trying to see him in the setting of traditional religious ideas; and Jesus tells him that he could only see him in His Kingdom. Much of our trouble to-day is that we are trying to know Jesus in the setting of our traditional religious ideas. We are forever trying to place him in the dusty pigeonholes of creeds and confessions,—the dead letter of old controversies; and we lose him in a mist of words. We say ponderous and labored things about His divinity, or deity, or the Incarnation . . . when all the time we cannot, we haven't the faculty to attach any real content to any of these terms, and we lose Jesus in a mist of words. The writer of this gospel saw Him . . . and all he could say was, "We beheld His glory"—by which he meant that He saw something

greater than he could say. "We beheld His glory." Leave it at that Yes, if only we could see Him in His kingdom, we would indeed leave it at that; for we should see Him to be greater than anything we could say about Him,—a vision which would send us, speechless and adoring . . . to our knees.

Yet not a vision of one remote from us, on

"Heights too high for our aspiring,"

but one intimate and near and friendly. The Christ of theology is hardly accessible to common men; but the Christ of spiritual vision is close at hand—in our streets and highways, in the valleys and on the hills. Some of you may recall Francis Thompson's lines where he tells of the things he sees in this "world invisible"—

When so sad, thou canst not sadder
Cry and on thy so sore loss,
Shall shine the traffic of Jacob's ladder
Pitched between heaven and Charing Cross
Yes on the night, my soul, my daughter
Cry clinging heaven by the hems,
And lo! Christ walking on the waters
Not of Gennaseret but Thames.

This is the life to which the heavens are always open, in which men stand upon the earth as upon a footstool and laugh and reach their hands among the stars,—a life infinite and frontierless, endless in its reach, boundless in its grasp, a life unimaginably more splendid in its resources and its vision than anything that eye hath seen or ear heard or hath entered into the heart of man.

Secondly: it is the life of true freedom. Of freedom we speak much and say many great things about it. We enlarge upon civil freedom, religious freedom, freedom of conscience and the like; but has it ever occurred to you that all these things may be denied to us and we may still be free? It was a wise man and an understanding who sang

Stone walls do not a prison make.

Paul was no less a freeman though he was a prisoner in Philippi. For true freedom is an inward thing; and this freedom of the spirit no tyranny can limit or despotism destroy. It is not accessible to those who would repress it, because it is within us; and it ranges a country where no monarch's writ runs. Even though we may possess all the outward forms of freedom, it does not follow that we are free; for we may be without inner freedom . . . and be the slaves of a thousand tyrannies. No man is indeed fully free, until he has ceased to be afraid. The last enemy of freedom is fear; and he alone is wholly free who fears nothing, who has lost the fear of men and the fear of things, the fear of to-morrow and the fear of death; and knows that he can stand anything that may happen to him. This is the man who as Lowell has said of him

"dares to be
In the right with two or three . . ."

or even indeed to

"stand alone
While the man he agonizes for hurls the contumelious stone."

The perfect type of the freeman is after all the martyr at the stake; and the supreme symbol of liberty is the Cross.

And this inner freedom comes with the new life. "The wind bloweth where it listeth . . . so is everyone that is born of the spirit. For the new life is itself so rich an endowment that we require little else of life, that we are straightway delivered from fear and care. You remember Augustine's definition of freedom: *Love God and do as you please*. Which translated into the idiom of our present discussion is this: Be born again . . . and go ahead! Be true to your new life through everything. And having this new life, come sun, come storm, come poverty, come riches, yea, come rack, come rope, you are free with a freedom that no power in the heaven above or the earth beneath or even in hell itself can ever hurt or destroy."

And last of all, we shall tell men that this life gains a new direction, a new objective. Our eye which was hitherto turned

inward is now turned outward; and where once we knew only our own need, now we know no need of our own but only the deep need of our brethren. Whereas once one thought of oneself as a metropolis to which all roads should lead and all the world bring tribute; now he sees himself a distributing center from which a road leads to every human need. Once the hand was stretched out to grasp whatever it could reach; now it is held out to give to him who lacks. It is as I said an entire change of direction, a new orientation, a blessed revolution.

And it is this because the new life brings with it a new scale of values. We live in a world which is drunken with the idea of success. Its watchwords are "Get on or get off," and "There is plenty of room on top," and the like; and its God is what is sometimes called the self-made man, who has too often been a man whose hand has been against every other man and whose success lay in driving all his competitors off the field. Well we know the end of that kind of worldly wisdom. The success we gain at the cost of others soon or late turns to bitterness, to utter irredeemable poverty of life. The Napoleons and Kaisers at last go to Canossa, or Amerongen or St. Helena. We sometimes stand aghast at the violent things that the revolutionary mind utters; but what it says is as nothing compared to what God does: "He hath put down the mighty from their seats; and the rich he hath sent empty away." And there is no prayer that falls more fitly from human lips than the old petition of the Moravian Liturgy—"From the unhappy desire of being great, good Lord deliver us."

And from that unhappy desire, the Good Lord does deliver men by bringing them to a new birth. They find greatness in service, and power in ministry. They find the joy of life isn't in what they get, but in what they give, not in what they acquire, but in what they create, not in what they possess, but in what they impart,—in what goes out of them rather than in what comes in. The glory of life lies not in the making of

money, but in the mending of men, not in success, but in sacrifice, not in fame, but in faithfulness, not in a crown, but in a cross. The world says there is plenty of room on top; but it lies. On that top there is room for only the few. But the Gospel calls us to a top upon which there is plenty of room for all of us. It is the top of Calvary, the mount of sacrifice and service. And the new birth is the gateway that leads to the unspeakable splendor of that mount.

This then is the life to which we are commissioned to call men; and to this task let us dedicate ourselves utterly. In season and out of season, let us challenge men and question them—why they choose to live the narrow, stuffy, dingy lives they do. Let us tell them that this new life is at their doors.

"The drift of pinions could we hearken
Beats at our clay shuttered doors."

Let us tell them that this greatest life, this superlife is surging round about them like a sea, trying to find its way through the dykes of their self regard, to break through the banks of their indifference—to bring them the life for which they were made. Let us say to them: Oh men and women, why will you crawl when you might fly with wings? Why grub among the roots when you might become familiar with the stars? Why will you live in prose when your life might be deathless song? Why be content with the clangor of the streets when you might listen to the music of the spheres? Oh, come along!

Yet let us ever be mindful that the power of our word never ceases to rest upon the faithfulness and the convincingness with which we live the life to which we are calling our brethren.

BROOKLYN, N. Y.

VII.

THE EXPERIENCE OF SIN, PREHISTORIC IN ORIGIN.

JAMES D. BUHRER, PH.D.

It is a fatiguing thing to be a human being. Compared with quadrupeds and fowls ours is a hard lot. In the first place we have to stand upright, a feat for which we are not yet completely adapted. Then we have to do more or less thinking. Before the arrival at selfconsciousness we feel something within constraining us to try to do good. But in the very trying we grow conscious of opposition which forces us to think harder, for we are perplexed as to the "why" of this evil.

The first Bible-answer to this question is, "Sin entered into the world," to which the mind proceeds with "Why did a good God permit its entrance?"

From time immemorial this has been life's great problem. It has engaged the mightiest minds of all ages. Ancient philosophers framed the theory that something inherent in the nature of things made it impossible for God to get rid of evil; that two eternal principles (Ormuzd and Ahrimanes) were in endless conflict for the possession of man, neither strong enough to permanently conquer the other. Grecian philosophers, already, propounded the question whether it was better to be born or not to have been born, and Job cursed the day of his birth.

Is a human life on earth, with all its experiences of moral strength, light and beauty, worth the cost? Have the human achievements, so laboriously won, really a value that could be secured in no other way?

SCIENCE.

"The universe is perfect where man, with his cares, is not known," said the German poet. But science declares that suffering prevailed on this earth ere man arrived; that the survival of the fittest is the law of the natural world; that God, like the great organ-builder bringing in a thousand possibilities of harmony, creates the possibilities of discords; that the possibility of harmony lies in the possibility of discords. It is an established fact that the further we move downward among the creatures inferior to man, the smaller seems to grow the capacity for pain and suffering. The jelly-fish shows no sign of pain.

PHILOSOPHY.

Philosophy is oft called "a vain deceit," "a mere speculation," "a beast driven by an evil spirit into the desert of confusion," "a pursuit of hell," "an handmaid to agnosticism and infidelity."

Nevertheless, every thinker is a philosopher. His notion of reality, the meaning of life and the nature of things constitute his philosophy. My philosophy is my way of looking at things. Buddhism, Confutianism and Christianity represent distinct philosophies of life, and can no more be equally true than can contrasting hypotheses in science. With the sweep of his horizon the philosopher begins to realize how much greater a thing is than he first thought, how deep its foundations lie buried in the human soul, how unescapable the spirit's thirst, like the homing instinct of the bird, for the God from whom it came. He sees that love and religion are in all men (in the one cursing, in the other blessing with ineffable benediction). And when he hears the deep in man calling for the deep in the eternal he is drawn closer to the heart of Him who revealed God as none other, and without whom man cannot come to himself. No system of philosophy is complete unless it deals also with this problem.

THE BIBLE.

This sacred book has for centuries been regarded as an infallible record. Infallible in what? In chronology, in history or grammar? Infallibility must be determined by the purpose of a thing. My watch is infallible, not with regard to the gold in the case, or the ability to tell me the date of coming events. The navigator finds his chart an infallible guide to the lighthouses, but it does not give him the time of day. A guide may lead you safely through the worst jungle without being able to utter a single sentence grammatically correct. The Bible's purpose is to exhibit Christ. "They are they that *testify* of me." "He that cometh unto *me*." That is not Scripture which does not lead to Christ.

The Bible language is a human vessel in which man carries the divine message to his erring fellowman. But there is no infallibility, written or spoken, by any fallible human being. My body is not perfect. Some parts of it are not even essential to the life of the whole, but it perfectly serves its purpose. Men who seek God in Christ find Him there. The Bible leads infallibly to Christ, but infallibility does not include inerrancy. Nowhere does the Bible claim infallibility for itself. If it did, how could we know it was not mistaken, for it has no life of experience in itself? There is only one known infallibility in the realm of human experience, and that is the ever-present, personal, living Christ. "I am the way, the truth and the life." He is self-authenticating. The Creator, through ages, impressed Himself on the human mind by human experiences and the Bible is an expression of this divine impression. Religion antedates the Bible and Christ was before there was a New Testament. If all foundations on which countless theories have been built up, were destroyed, the fact would still remain that for more than eighteen hundred years men have been born from above to a diviner life. Essential Christianity is the life of God in humanity, which is indestructible. Christ meets the need of sinful men. "This is life eternal, that they know thee" (J. 173).

FALL STORIES IN GENESIS.

The beginnings of human life lie beyond the reach of history. There is not and cannot be a record of the beginnings of consciousness or knowledge, except in the form of *reflections and imagination*. Genesis is a record of this kind, charged with the moral and religious lessons of the highest importance.

Science asks for the *where* and *how* of things in the sense-realm and takes for granted order, matter, motion and interrelation, while religious philosophy goes into the question of *cause* and ultimate or final inquiry of the *whence, why* and *whither*.

It is to this second question that Genesis gives reply. It is religious, not scientific. Everything here is regarded in relation to the eternal cause. God is mentioned 29 times in 31 verses. Of the creation of man, here, we have two distinct accounts, differing from one another in matter, diction and fundamental ideas.

The first account goes to 2:4-a, and is called "Elohistic," because its author calls God "Elohim." He depicts a series of phenomena flowing from the Unseen, filling space and time with the glory and goodness of God, and man, appearing at the end, as the earthly climax and lord. The center figure is God, from whom man, made in God's image, derives his dignity. Here woman is made contemporaneous with man. Their home is the vast creation under the domed sky, sun, moon and stars, teeming order of vegetables and animal life at their side. All is prepared for man to enjoy. The Elohist regards man as the intellectual head of creation and shows man's normal relation as the crown.

The second is the "Jehovistic" account (2:4-b-3:24). Its author calls God "Jehovah-Elohim." This writer does not proceed in any order from the formless void. There is no mention of days. Does he in 2:5, 6 intimate that plant-life was the result of human cultivation? Woman's creation here seems a kind of after-thought when Adam had failed to find a help-

mate among the animals. She is made from one of his ribs. Man's home in this account is determined by a series of adjustments. After he has arrived on the scene a garden is planted, animals are ordered and woman is created.

The Jehovist clearly regards all physical creation subordinate to the idea that man is a moral being and on trial. The horizon shrinks to the limits of Eden, but attention is intensified to the spiritual discipline of man, ending in the loss of his first estate, where his relation has become *abnormal*.

The *two accounts* are mutually complementary as a full description of man's relation to God and his environment, enabling us to better understand how man is at the head of *creation in one sense, and a failure in another sense, i.e.,* his dignity and his fall.

In *both* accounts man is regarded a part of the order of nature and as being above it; one with the animals in bodily frame and sense appetite; but also above this order, in that he is endowed with a special authority over all life. "Have dominion, etc." (1:26). In 2:19 he is given the capacity to name the animals, showing him the master by his *knowledge* of them.

He is described not as a higher degree of being, but as another kind of being, made in the image of God (1:26) or with the possibility of personalism, the basis of moral freedom. We are also informed that man's present condition is not what it was intended to be by the Creator, and that he lost his place by his own fault.

Divine and human personality are here put in striking contrast. The human is conscious of a relationship to the Divine, so that a free alliance, a deliberate revolt, is possible. God desires to be served by him, but the service must be voluntary. He is therefore put on trial so that the possibility of innocence may, by effort and discipline, be transformed into virtue, *i.e.,* moral character.

The Divine will expresses itself, by a command given to the human spirit, which the writer puts into symbolic form; the

essence of which is that Adam transgressed what he knew was against Divine will.

The temptation is represented as coming from without (serpent) and from within (desire). The two are wedded into *an act* which produced the condition of sin. There is no dualistic principle intimated. There is but one creator, who "made all things good." The choice of the wrong thing at the wrong time produces sin.

Is it a gain that man henceforth knows good and evil experimentally? If it is, it truly does not add to his blessedness. No experience at the sacrifice of communion with the Divine can be a gain since it loses the sense of self-approval. Adam and Eve are ashamed of one another and afraid of God. They lost a sure position and gained an uncertain future. The picture is dark.

The *Elohist* writer shows what went to the making of man. What more there may be in his history! Whether this has issued into a masterpiece or a failure as compared with man's state prior to or following the state of innocence, he does not say. The *Jehovist* follows with the tale of a man as actual, as he is in point of history and fact.

THE PENALTY.

The penalties of this wilful transgression are said to be disappointment and burden, instead of pleasure. The free human spirit is now under tyranny of the natural laws, suffering pain, decay and death, due to the withdrawal of the sustenance from the tree of life (3:2). From all this Paul deduces his statement (I Cor. 15:22).

Is the current conception of a fall based chiefly on this Genesis story or on Milton's *Paradise Lost*, where Adam is pictured as a philosophic courtier in the light of the sixteenth century and the manner of a diplomat, a full-grown man, masquerading under the condition of childhood, a monstrosity? In Genesis Adam is described as a simple child, unlearned, untried, fallible and easily tempted, because innocent.

The *style* of this sin story is simple, incisive, vivid and brief, interwoven with Hebrew religion which was comparatively primitive, but better far than heathenic myth. (The story of the angel and the sword is purely mythical.) The serpent is described as a clever and not as an evil beast. The whole record takes for granted that man was intended to be an agriculturist (2:5, 15; 3:17), and the garden is an idea that originated in the agricultural days of Israel that followed their nomadic life. Eden is rather a divine homestead than a sanctuary. Not until Chapter 3:20 does the word "Eve" appear as a proper noun; nor do we know whether it is derived from the word "Hevah" or is an Hebraized foreign word.

There is no reference to the endowment of Adam and Eve, but a capacity to obey and disobey God's command is implied. All this matter, however, in the irenical age was interpreted literally and so became authentic history.

SELF-WILL.

This story is not the record of the beginning of consciousness, or knowledge, but a story of sin that robbed man of happiness. All unhappiness in life has to do with conscience. Disobedience blights life and produces death. It is a truly dramatic representation of what takes place in every man's personal history. We are all born in the Eden of innocence, having no experimental knowledge of good and evil. Slowly there comes to us the law to obey, a prohibition to be honored, a temptation to taste the forbidden fruit, and we, like sheep, do go astray. We long to know good and evil by experience, prompted by curiosity or self-will, and so trod the beaten path of ages.

This is the ethical experience of Genesis 3 without an effort to doctrinize. It is the experience of every man. The writer says what Adam *did* with experience, and not what he could or should have done.

OTHER FALLS.

1. *Hate*.—The next fall is that of Cain, the eldest son of Adam and Eve. His sin is not so much in the murder as in his attitude to the Maker, expressing itself in the jealousy that produces the crime. (*Cf.* I J. 3:11, 12; Heb. 11:14.) Love is converted into hatred and murder. With this fall begins a double genealogy, one of progressive degeneration and the other of redemptive forces.

2. *Civilization*.—The third fall is with the fifth generation depicted in the Song of Lamech, a descendant of the city-builder, Cain. The discovery of weapons and witchery of act fail to purify the affections of man, yea develop passions and possibilities of evil. The father of this Hebrew Vulcan (Tubalcain) profits with irons to foster the spirit of revenge. The polygamist too ends in crime.

3. *Unnatural Relationship*.—Then comes the story of the sons of God regarding the daughters of man as fair, or the deterioration of man's moral and spiritual nature in a *higher race* by sexual relationship, showing how the lower side of it has more power to invoke evil than the higher has to redeem. And there follows the hopeless condition necessitating the complete extermination of man.

4. *Pride*.—The last fall story in Genesis is that of the record of the tower of Babel, and deals with the degrading effect of Godless intellectual development and scientific research, used not for spiritual perfection, but self-sufficiency. Mere growth of intellect brings differences, degrees, castes, grades, divisions, diverse tongues, hostile communities, in short intellectual pride. Was this in connection with Babylon's astrology, with its attempt to scan and mount the heavens and once more become like God?

Thus is described the power of evil in the threefold activity of human nature—affection, will, and intellect, brought home in vivid stories—mythical or legendary—woven into forceful spiritual lessons, whatever their historic value may be.

HOPE.

The writers of these fall stories are not pessimistic. On the dark background of sin and its effects they permit the relief of Divine redemption. "God never left Himself without witness to any age." Among the worst communities are found men who are not given over as their fellowmen to hopeless sin. They kept alive the conscience, choice and obedience to higher laws and sense of relationship to the author of mankind.

Man is a spiritual being. As such he has an ideal destiny which from the beginning has been interfered with, and so far as man is concerned, defeated, because he failed to maintain sonship. The moral poison entailed all kinds of disabilities and penal consequences. Along with the record of sin in the Bible is the record of redemption—God's gradual unfolding love, through Abel, Seth, Enoch, Noah, of prehistoric ages, who lifted themselves above the sordidness of their times preparatory to the culminating personality of the Incarnate.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

VIII.

THE NEW FREEDOM.

THEODORE F. HERMAN.

One of our prominent preachers has recently directed our attention to an ominous parallel between Noah's time and our own. When the Lord saw that the wickedness of men was great in the earth, it repented him that he had made man on the earth, and he said, I will destroy man. He sent the deluge. Only Noah, the righteous man and his family, were saved. And now the earth was cleansed. The besom of God's wrath had swept it clean, and the radiant bow of promise that spanned the sky marked the beginning of a new era. But, alas, immediately after the deluge we read the dismal record "and Noah was drunk." Out of that cleansing flood there came a new earth, but Noah, its chief denizen, was drunk.

We, too, have just emerged from a deluge of woe. For many times forty days and nights our world has been under dark clouds. Unparalleled floods of suffering and sorrow have descended upon it. But now the waters have receded. A new world has emerged. Now, surely, after these apocalyptic experiences, this tear-washed, blood-cleansed earth ought to be clean. But alas, the Bolsheviks are drunk, and others, elsewhere, with less excuse than the Russians, are manifesting similar symptoms of intoxication with the heady wine of unaccustomed freedom. Menacing portents meet our gaze in many quarters of the sky. They give point to the grave question whether, after all, the war has been the Red Sea through which mankind has passed from bondage to freedom or whether it will prove to be a Dead Sea, the tomb of fond hopes and fine ambitions.

Is there really such a thing as human freedom, or is the freedom of the will, as Spencer held, one of the inveterate delusions of mankind? From remote times philosophers have debated the question whether men are free or fated. Each side has had its able champions, but neither has won its case. Formerly each side of the controversy demanded the unconditional surrender of its opponent. To-day both sides are ready for a peace without victory. They recognize that we cannot discard either liberty or law without damaging both. Liberty without law is license, and authority without freedom is despotism. And neither the one nor the other is in harmony with the facts of the universe as interpreted by modern science and philosophy. It is quite generally recognized to-day that liberty and law, autonomy and authority, are not contradictory and exclusive but complementary. The business of philosophers is not to eliminate the one or the other from their systems of truth, but to harmonize both. Each represents an important aspect of reality.

Certainly, the famous doctrine of necessity finds few advocates to-day. It has an ancient and honorable career, but it has run its course. Its main branches, fatalism and predestination, are sadly withered. Fatalism put the reins of the universe into the hands of blind fate or into the relentless grip of natural law. Predestination maintained that the will of God has decreed the course of everything. Both made the individual the creature of predetermined necessity. He was the impotent plaything of forces beyond his control. But that is Prussianism in philosophy. And the best thought of our age, whether scientific, philosophical or theological, affirms that the universe in which we live is not "kaiserized." It is not an autocratic order of existence, whether the autocracy be that of matter or of a divine mind. Unquestionably this universe is under the reign of law, but there is room in it for genuine freedom. Out of it there emerges, at last, a being who is not a mere machine. He is a man, and in him we find the mysterious and majestic capacity of self-determination.

A similar fate has befallen the theory of absolute freedom. It, too, has few friends to-day. In fact it is even less possible for us to believe in unrestricted choice, or unlimited freedom, than in absolute necessity. The champions of this illusory notion endowed man with an amazing faculty, which enabled him to do what he pleased. He had a "will" that was forever free. It was a charming device that enabled man, as it were, to life himself out of his heredity and pull himself out of his environment. But it was not in accord with the facts of our enlarging experience. It involved a denial of the physical and spiritual unity and solidarity of mankind, and a repudiation of the indubitable fact that the life of every individual is largely determined by his racial heredity and his social environment. Hence the theory of unrestricted choice, like that of absolute determination has been quite universally discarded. Our freedom, however real, is not unlimited. It is tremendously restricted in its range. The universe is not "kaiserized" but neither is it Bolshevik. It is ruled neither by fate nor by caprice. There is law in it and liberty; an inviolable order of things and endless progress.

We may well rejoice that modern thought has discarded both absolute determinism and unrestricted freedom. These ancient contradictory theories may be called, respectively, the autocratic and the anarchic interpretations of the universe. Neither the one nor the other furnishes an adequate dynamic of life. From opposite premises they lead to strangely similar practical conclusions. In the last analysis it matters little whether it is blind fate that determines the conduct of men and the course of history, or the inscrutable will of God, or the arbitrary caprice of individuals. Each of the three is an unknown and unknowable quantity. The future conduct of men and nations and the ultimate destiny of mankind are taken out of the realm of moral certainty, or even rational probability. These important matters become dark and doubtful to say the least, and it becomes foolish to attempt to construct a philosophy of history, or to see a purposive process

running through the ages to its consummation, and to make that the goal of noble endeavor and the aim of unselfish consecration. Modern thought saves us from this paralyzed will and from this blighted hope. It affirms its faith in law and in liberty, but it stoutly denies that either of them is absolute in its sway. There is law in the universe, but its authority is not autocratic and there is also freedom in the universe, genuine self-determination, but it is not the unrestricted liberty of anarchism. Through law, and under its benign sway, men must achieve moral freedom. And in freedom, as its consummate fruit, law will find its ultimate vindication and justification.

If, now, we return from this little excursion into the gray field of speculation to the green field of life, several things become self-evident. The autocracy of a kaiser, or anything like it, is doomed, because it is false authority; and so is Bolshevism, for the opposite reason, because it is false freedom. The former crushes liberty and the latter denies law. Both, therefore, are defective and dangerous. And, if successful, the autocracy of a kaiser and the anarchism of a Lenine, would lead to identical results. There would be no chance in this world for the development of genuine freedom under the constraint of law. Arbitrary caprice, whether of an anointed majesty or of a besotted mass, would rule the world and ruin it. And, as one who believes that this universe is a rational and a moral order, that back of it lies neither autocracy nor anarchy, neither kaiserism nor Bolshevism, I do not hesitate to affirm that neither of these twain evils can become dominant upon earth. They are travesties and caricatures, respectively, of authority and of liberty. But mankind will not be content permanently with either one or the other. They must pass away and give place to a nobler conception of freedom in which liberty is restricted by law and in which law leads to liberty. Recent history has confirmed this verdict in respect to autocracy. We have repudiated, forever, an authority that denies all freedom. Sooner or later, history will likewise

repudiate anarchism, the specious liberty that denies and defies all law. And then the New Freedom will be at hand that shall at the same time be the True Freedom. Then, I say, in the great "To-morrow" of history, when mankind shall have learned to weld into one harmonious whole law and liberty, authority and autonomy, then there will dawn the era of true freedom, when all shall know that "He is the freeman whom the truth makes free, and none is free beside."

But to-day, after the great war, we do indeed have a new freedom, but it is not yet the true freedom. It would be utterly foolish to deny that the downfall of the Hohenzollerns has brought us to a new era in the development of human freedom. But it would be utterly futile to affirm that the overthrow of political autocracy is the final consummation of freedom. The logic of events, since the Armistice concluded the war, would prove the utter futility of such a claim. For in this world, made safe for democracy by the crushing defeat of autocracy, we see types of democracy that have run amuck. In our free world we see freedom rioting in anarchy. I repeat, therefore, that to-day we have a new freedom that is not yet the true freedom.

Unquestionably, we have a new freedom to-day. On the eleventh of November, 1918, the world became safe for democracy. On that memorable day our victorious armies wrote "Finis" to a long chapter of history that is filled with the chronicles of despotism. On that day the last of the Pharaohs heard the voice of the Almighty, through the thunder of many guns, bidding them, "Let the people go." On that day the military conflict against autocracy ended with a decisive victory over the kaiser, and thus the world became safe for democracy. And that is the new freedom which is ours to-day. It means that in a kaiserless world the peoples of the earth, large and small, have the right of self-determination, the right to determine their own destiny. It means that to-day, and forever we trust, no autocrat, be he benevolent or malevolent, can plead a divine right to perpetrate human

wrongs. It means the final consummation of political freedom.

But do we realize, with equal clearness, that the same day which marked the close of the military conflict also inaugurated a moral war? We engaged in a great military conflict to make the world safe for democracy. Now we must make democracy safe for the world. And that is a moral conflict. And only when that conflict has been won shall we have the true freedom.

Thus, the eleventh of November, 1918, is truly the beginning of a new era. There are not many such hours in the history of mankind. They are separated by many centuries. When they come they witness the travail of nations, and out of the travail, with anguish and anxiety, something new is born. Such an hour, big with destiny, with promise and menace, is the eleventh of November last, when the world became safe for democracy, and when the victorious nations realized that the greater task still remains unfinished, the task, namely, of making democracy safe for the world.

And what, now, does the phrase imply? What do we mean by making democracy safe for the world? What, indeed, do we mean by democracy? Before the war, to many an American democracy meant the Democratic Party. For multitudes it had merely political significance. It meant a certain theory of government. That, of course, is one of its meanings. It may denote a free government, of and for and by the people. But it means vastly more than this. You may have a monarchy like England and yet find in it genuine democracy. You may have a democracy like America, and yet find in it czars of politics and kaisers of industry. To-day, there are doubtless men for whom democracy still has merely political significance. But there are millions for whom the term has assumed a far deeper meaning. It was the spirit of democracy that sent us into the war, but that spirit did not come out of the war as it went in. And I have in mind not merely, or chiefly, its diffusion throughout the world or its intensifica-

tion. That, to be sure, has been a result of the war. The spirit of democracy has been universally diffused and tremendously intensified. Democracy has passed through the furnace of great affliction; it has been forged on the anvil of life; it has been purchased with a great price of blood, and tears, and treasure. And to-day the great masses of mankind, on this blood-drenched and tear-washed earth, are fused into one spirit. They demand imperiously that this world shall remain safe for democracy and they yearn wistfully that democracy shall be made safe for the world.

But the war has brought another change, more dramatic and dynamic than that. It has clarified the meaning of democracy. It has moralized and spiritualized the conception. Most assuredly it has done that for us here in America. It has taught us the full and true meaning of democracy. It has helped us to find our soul as a nation. Not that we had ever lost our national soul. It sheds its luster upon every page of our history, from the colonial and provincial, through the sectional, to the national era. Always it was the soul of democracy that spoke and acted in our history, striving for the larger freedom of man, and battling for naked human rights against vested wrongs.

Whether it fought against England or against the South or against Spain; whether it battled against foreign political foes of freedom or against its native industrial enemies. And yet our soul, being a living spirit, was also a growing spirit. And in 1917, when we declared war against imperial Germany, our national soul, as it were, became full-fledged and full-orbed. Then we wrote a new declaration of the inter-dependence of all mankind. We declared a new Monroe Doctrine, international and universal. We proclaimed a new creed of democracy, the creed that this neighborhood world of ours must be made a brotherhood world; yea, that democracy means that men are brothers and not brutes, and that fraternity and coöperation must take the place of fratricidal competition.

What is there more wonderful in the great war than the

gradual moralization of the meaning of democracy here among us? How that old word "democracy" shines with a new luster to-day. How the gold of it has been refined and the dross burnt away in the crucible of war. How that precious gold has been recoined into richer truth in pulpit and press, in parliaments and pamphlets, and in speeches innumerable. Gradually, under the stress of war and in the light of events, we have come to realize that, fundamentally, democracy is not an institution, but an inspiration; not a political theory but a human philosophy; not a form of government but a spirit of life, an outlook upon life and an attitude towards it.

Essentially, democracy is a theory of man and of his relation to the universe. It raises the question, what is man? What is his origin and destiny, his ground in the past and his goal in the future? Autocracy says, Man is a clod, an atom, a cog in a vast machine. That is the spirit of autocracy, its quintessence, whether incarnate in a Pharaoh or a kaiser, in a political autocracy or an industrial plutocracy. It is the denial of the supreme worth of man, of the priceless value of human personality. It is the betrayal of man to matter, of the spirit to soulless things. It is the refusal to let man go forth in freedom to work out his destiny. Democracy says, Man is the crown of creation and all things are made for him. And though a mere atom, yet he is infinite in potentiality, and dynamic in power, like all atoms. That is the quintessence of democratic, whether incarnate in Moses or Mazzini, in Luther or Lincoln, in Washington or Wilson, in Joffre or in Jesus of Nazareth.

Thus, the real issue between democracy and autocracy is not political, but moral and spiritual. What is the universe, is it a mechanism, or a spiritual organism? What is of supreme value in the universe, is it matter or man? That is the real issue between democracy and autocracy. In the last analysis autocracy is materialism. It regards the universe as a soulless mechanism. It treats men as machines, instead of persons; as things to be manipulated and controlled instead of

free beings gifted with the privilege of choosing for themselves. It claims that in this mechanistic universe might is right, and that only the fit survive and march to their victory through fields red with blood of the weak and unfit. And democracy is idealism, it is a radiant faith in man. It claims that right is might. It believes that the strong must serve the weak and help the unfit to become fit. And it was the war that clarified the vision of millions, and taught them to see this true meaning of democracy as a moral issue.

I do not say that this conception of democracy originated during the war. That would be a vast exaggeration. The eleventh of November marks a new era, but no era is absolutely new. History is not a series of new beginnings. It is an organic process of development. Yet this process, though continuous, is also cumulative, yea culminative. The unfolding life of mankind reaches great tension points, when the forces that have ripened slowly and in secret burst forth openly. So to-day! We are witnessing the consummation of a movement whose beginnings lie in remote ages. That movement is Democracy. There is nothing more interesting in human history than the genesis and growth of this spirit of democracy. Hegel summed up his philosophy of history in the pregnant sentence, "The history of the world is nothing but the development of the idea of freedom." He did not see, nor did anyone else in modern Germany, that freedom means not merely freedom from external bondage, but also freedom to follow conscience and reason; and that the one is in order to the other. But we agree with Hegel that history is the record of human freedom, of its gradual achievement and its progressive realization. And that age-long struggle for human freedom is also the essence of democracy. Accordingly, democracy reaches far back into the past. It had its leaders among the great nations of antiquity. Moses was a champion of democracy, when, in the name of God he demanded of Pharaoh, "Let my people go." And in ancient Greece, the student finds a galaxy of philosophers, dramatists, and statesmen, who were fine prophets of democracy.

Thus democracy had an early start in history. But the promise of fuller realization, that gleams here and there in the life and literature of antiquity, was never fulfilled. There came the time when the Roman Empire, the heir of all the past ages, fell. But ere it fell God had lodged within it the tiny seed of a movement that contained not merely the promise but also the potency of all true freedom. And now the theatre of history shifted from East to West. God led new races into its arena. And directly a new chapter began in the history of freedom. It began when these new races of northern and central Europe had passed from their barbarian childhood to civilized manhood. The Catholic Church had absorbed these many tribes, representing various racial elements, into her organization. She had used her autocratic authority to discipline and drill them into Christian manhood. Under her stern and wholesome tutelage these wild children of the forest and plain had become men. And, as is the wont of men, they began to chafe under the external restraints of the mighty church. There welled up in the late middle ages, from the deep of humanity, forces which no human power could crush or curb. Conscience and reason awoke. They protested and rebelled against autocracy. Men sought right and truth undeterred by papal bulls or imperial bans. Nations were born within the Holy Roman Empire, and others travailed to be born. And within these new-born nations great personalities appeared who discarded the Latin tongue and fashioned the languages of modern Europe. And in the vernacular these great men preached and taught and wrought wonders.

Gradually, the homogeneous mass of mankind, held together by the authority of the Catholic Church, broke up into heterogeneous parts. And each constituent part worked out its racial traits within national bounds. We see man faring forth on the uncharted sea of freedom, experimenting in the vast laboratory of life to gain experience. And he did gain experience. He found within himself moral and mental capacities to know the truth and to do the right. He found

within himself a hunger for righteousness and truth whose satisfaction was denied him by his autocratic rulers in church and state.

And thus, in the age of the Renaissance a new-born creature stands upon the earth, the like of whom the world has never seen. A man autonomous and defiant, protesting against autocracies and demanding his freedom from bondage. It was the spirit of democracy, aroused from its mediæval sepulcher, and beginning its triumphant march through history. From that time to this, that spirit has never rested, nor ceased from troubling the autocrats of the world. In the sixteenth century it rebelled against the ecclesiastical autocracy represented by the Catholic Church and sought and found spiritual and religious freedom. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries this same spirit rebelled against the autocracy of sense and matter as expressed in dominant philosophies, and the result was Kant's idealism. In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries that same spirit rebelled against the political autocracy represented by the Bourbons, and the result was the French Revolution and the shaking of every throne in Europe. Finally, in our own age, that same spirit turned its searchlight of reason and conscience upon the last bulwark of autocracy in the economic sphere of life.

Thus, during the last four centuries, we see man climbing the heights where for ages popes and kings had stood, proclaiming their vested rights and their divine privileges. Like Lazarus, man used to lie at the outer gate begging for crumbs. But now Lazarus had heard a mighty voice, be it from pit or pinnacle, bidding him "Come forth." History had loosed him and let him go. Now he stood upright on the steps of thrones boldly demanding his human rights. And neither pope nor king could hush his voice or crush his spirit. Where his demands were refused, became a revolutionary seeking to overthrow the old order, or a prophet proclaiming the advent of a new order, in which autocracies shall be no more. And when the war burst upon us in 1914 that spirit of democracy

was ripe everywhere, and rising in a swelling tide throughout the world. In every civilized country men were clamoring for their human rights, and protesting against every form of autocracy, economic as well as political.

The war, then, did not create this spirit of democracy. But it gave it a baptism of blood. It clarified and intensified it. It endued it with great power and it girded it with a clear purpose. Before the war that spirit flourished chiefly among social iconoclasts, where, frequently, it found wild utterance and led to wicked deed. To-day it permeates our whole social structure from pit to dome. We may loathe it or like it, we may view it with fear or favor. But we must recognize its pervasive presence and reckon with its growing power. There is in that new spirit of democracy, diffused throughout the world, the menace of a revolution as well as the promise of an evolution. And nothing is of greater moment at this time than to help that spirit to find itself; to curb its extravagance and to control its vast creative energy; to make it a constructive force instead of a destructive fury.

There is in it the menace of a revolution that may well stagger the stoutest heart. It is the menace of Bolshevism, using that term in its wider significance. And Bolshevism is the travesty of democracy, the caricature of freedom. In varying degrees it threatens the whole world. America is more immune from its virus than war-torn Europe. But Russia, Germany, and Hungary are reeling under the shock of its impact upon their corporate life and no country is proof against its insidious and specious propaganda. To call Bolshevism a child of the war, one of its many resultant evils, is to misread history. The reverse is truer to fact. Far from being born and bred during the war, the spirit incarnate in Bolshevism was banished by the great catastrophe from countries where it had been brooding for years. The common danger fused divergent spirits into perfect unity. But the end of the war also marked the end of this transient exorcism of the spirit of Bolshevism. It has resumed its former sway,

and with redoubled energy it seeks world wide dominion. I call Bolshevism a menace because in the sacred name of liberty, it tramples upon law; because it dethrones law in order to enthrone license; because it puts in the place of old autocracies of aristocrats and the bourgeoisie the despotism of an inflamed and embittered proletariat, because its rule contains within itself the seeds of dissolution of our social order and the death of our Christian civilization. Let Bolshevism rule the world and you will set back the clock of human progress for a thousand years.

But how shall we stem the destructive tide of Bolshevism or stop it from overthrowing the established order, whose foundations were laid by the toil and travail of countless generations, and whose consummation is our only hope for the future? Not by vituperation and denunciation. That may afford a welcome relief to our outraged feelings, but it is no remedy for the malady. A policy of denunciation and forcible suppression is never remedial. It will only aggravate and spread Bolshevism, instead of curing it. To cure it we must remove its cause. We must heal the deadly disease of which Bolshevism is the surface manifestation, the putrid and most pronounced symptom. That deadly social disease is industrial and economic autocracy. All our prophylactic measures against Bolshevism will fail until we treat it as the effect of a deep-seated cause. They will prove futile until we attack and remove that cause. Bolshevism is the blind and blundering effort on the part of the proletariat, the Fourth Estate, to extend the principle of democracy into the realm of industry. In one form or another, it will continue to trouble the earth until that aim has been achieved.

For ages, princes and priests ruled the world with autocratic power. But gradually, the scepter was wrested from their hands. First the barons and the burghers, the Third Estate, disputed and restricted their sovereignty. A century ago the bourgeoisie ascended the throne of kings. And our own day has witnessed the world's last glorious exodus from royal op-

pression and feudal despotism. The age-long struggle for political freedom has been won. But the final overthrow of political autocracy has not ushered in the millennium of universal prosperity and peace. There must be a further enlargement of democracy. Even as autocracy has been stripped of its power and prestige in the political arena, so it must now be driven from its last refuge in the industrial sphere. That is the imperious demand of the Fourth Estate, the proletariat, constituting the great mass of mankind. They want to push back the frontier of autocracy until it vanishes from the earth. They want to extend the principle of democracy until all our human relations and activities, including industry and commerce, are brought under its beneficent sway. That is the great issue of our time. The war has made it acute. There will be no rest nor peace until it has been settled equitably. And only thus will the menace of Bolshevism be removed permanently. The symptom will disappear when the disease is cured. The tempestuous fever that vexes us to-day will be stilled when the tumor has been removed that gnaws at the vitals of our social order.

There is in that new spirit of democracy, diffused throughout the world, also the promise of an evolution. In Bolshevism and kindred movements that spirit is running riot. But in multitudes of men it is soberly and seriously grappling with the great problem of making democracy safe for the world. They realize that the new freedom which is ours to-day, won by military might, is not enough to ensure the future peace and happiness of mankind. So long as the kaiser was on his throne, menacing the freedom of mankind, there was nothing else to do but to conquer him and crush his diabolical ambition. But now, in our kaiserless world, there is something else to do. And the moralized spirit of democracy is seeking to do it and, thus, hasten the day of true freedom for all mankind.

There is, for example the League of Nations. Its advocates do not claim that this league will establish millennial harmony

in international relationships. There is no such easy road as that to the millennium. We want the League of Nations as an ark of safety in a very imperfect world, but not as a means of salvation. It will confer many substantial benefits upon the world, but it will never bind the hearts of mankind into a league of friendship and faith. At best, it can merely banish the bane of war, but it can never bestow the blessings of brotherhood. At the most, it can only make permanent the new political freedom, for which millions have died, but it cannot establish the true freedom. That rests on other foundations than those laid by a League of Nations.

And it is this true freedom which multitudes of men are envisaging to-day. The war has engendered new aspirations and hopes within them. They see a world, plowed and furrowed by four bitter years of war ready for the planting of a new harvest. They believe that an age that has repudiated the kaiser's Weltpolitik, whose aim was brutish domination and selfish exploitation, is prepared to try that Weltpolitik whose earthly objective is human brotherhood. They think that now is the accepted time, the time of great urgency and unparalleled opportunity. Now, in this kaiserless world, they would lead mankind forward into an age in which kaiserism shall be no more.

Will these iridescent dreams come true? Yes, sometime, in God's great To-morrow, they will be fulfilled. Ultimately, this neighborhood world of ours will become a brotherhood world. That is the far off divine event towards which the whole creation moves.

"Dreamer of dreams? We take the taunt with gladness,
Knowing that God, beyond the years we see,
Has wrought the dreams, that count with you for madness,
Into the texture of the world to be."

And to nourish that secret hope within one's heart is not madness, not the frenzied faith of feeble folk. Nay, it is the only reasonable interpretation of the universe, the only rational key to human history. It is not merely faith that denies the

cynic's despair of mankind, but the facts of history and experience as well. It is not only religion that kindles the vast hope of a golden age, but reason supports it. Reason, interpreting the facts of universal life, sees one increasing purpose running through the ages. That purpose is the development and establishment of freedom. And that purpose points unmistakably to a divine purposer. History is His Story. It is the gradual realization of His purpose. And His purpose is to make men free through the truth. Some day that divine purpose will be consummated. Mankind will be free indeed because they know and do the truth that God is the Father of all men, and that all are brethren. That is the bottom fact of the universe, the law that controls and determines life. All defiance of that law is license but not liberty, and leads to ruin. *Whether it is kaiserism that defies it, or Bolshevism, matters not at all in the final reckoning. Whether it is set at naught in political life or repudiated in the industrial and economic sphere does not alter the verdict. And all compliance with that law is freedom and leads to life abundant, to righteousness and peace and joy.*

Thus the real choice, the only choice that fronts mankind is freedom and fulness of life through compliance with the law of the universe which is the will of God, or moral suicide. Consummation or annihilation. There is no other alternative.

Men and nations are free to choose between moral suicide and *moral self-determination in harmony with the fundamental law of existence*, which is grounded in the character of God, wrought into the very texture of the universe, and, gradually, into the fabric of history. Now, personally, I do not think that mankind is on the road to commit moral suicide. I believe, on the contrary, that our race is slowly and painfully toiling up to the heights of moral self-determination. And I believe that as "we go to prove our soul, we shall arrive" . . . sometime!

But the question that interests us profoundly is whether now, in this new era, mankind will go forward into true

freedom, so that the historian of the future, looking back upon these apocalyptic years, and recounting their debit and credit, will say, the cost of the great war was appalling in men and money, but it was worth all it cost in tears and treasure, because in that Pentecost of Calamity mankind was baptized with the spirit of brotherhood. That is the imperious question of the hour. Has the war quickened a new spirit in humanity so that a new civilization will arise on the shattered ruins of the old; a civilization in which fraternal coöperation shall take the place of fratricidal competition, and where men will work and play and pray together as brothers, instead of preying upon each other like brutes?

To raise such questions is to invite controversy; to answer them is to attempt prophecy. No man can predict the immediate outcome of the moral war to make democracy safe for the world that began anew when the military victory was achieved that made the world safe for democracy. We may beguile our yearning hearts with eager hopes; we may cloud our hopes with anxious fears. But no one knows whether our hopes will deceive us or whether our fears will betray us. The future is shrouded behind a thick curtain that the hand of man cannot lift nor his eye pierce.

But there is something vastly better we can do. We can face the foe of true freedom and forge the weapon to crush him. That foe is kaiserism. Not the Kaiser, but the spirit that ruled him and his clique; the spirit that caused the war and plunged the world into an abyss of suffering and sorrow; the spirit of materialism and selfishness. The Kaiser and his Junkers were the very incarnation of that spirit of evil. In them we saw materialism armed and aggressive, defying all the laws of God and man. We saw selfishness, organized and equipped with all the methods and means of science to gain its unholy ends. And as we saw these things in our enemy, materialism and selfishness full-grown and undisguised, we learned to know and despise them as never before. That appalling spectacle of rampant materialism quickened our

sluggish sense of spiritual values. It aroused our moral indignation. We saw that the triumph of that spirit would be the greatest tragedy of history. We realized that it must be conquered and crushed if there was to be any health or happiness among the nations of the earth.

But that same spirit existed long before the war, and it exists now in the world made safe for democracy by our military victory. It is lifting its ugly head in countries that are still reeling from the shock of battle, and it raised its venomous voice at the Peace Conference in Paris. And we have seen that spirit of kaiserism here in America, in our hearts and homes, in our social, industrial and political life. You may call it what name you please—the remnant of the brute in man, the residue of the jungle, or selfishness or sin. But, by whatever name you call it, we know it well. It is the spirit of the Corsican, not that of the Galilean. It is Nietzsche's superman and Macchiavelli's Prince. It is the spirit of might and greed, that crushes weakness and despises meekness. The spirit that calls the beatitudes of Jesus platitudes. That is the spirit we must conquer and crush if democracy is to be made safe for the world, and if mankind is to enter into a life of true freedom.

And there is only one weapon can crush that mighty foe entrenched in the heart of man. Not armies nor navies; not money nor munitions. These are the weapons that conquer a kaiser, but they cannot crush kaiserism. They are military weapons for military ends. They can make the world safe for democracy, but they cannot make democracy safe for the world. Only moral weapons can do that. A Moses may lead Israel out of bondage to the borders of Canaan, but one mightier than Moses is needed to lead humanity into the promised land of true freedom. That one is God.

True freedom is more than liberty. It is liberty and love. Safe democracy also, is more than liberty. It is liberty permeated with the spirit of service and sacrifice. And that is the spirit needed by our blood-bought democracy to make it

safe for a world that has achieved its final exodus from outward tyranny—the spirit of unselfish love. That is the only spirit that will lead us forward into true freedom. Bolshevik and capitalist alike need it to curb the kaiserism that lurks in their hearts. The world needs it to link its toiling masses and its ruling classes into a brotherhood of man. And God alone can kindle that spirit in human hearts.

An autocracy, whether political or industrial, has no room for God in its selfish materialism. It is consonant with atheism, even though it wear the livery of religion and speak its language; for all its ultimate purposes run counter to the establishment of God's kingdom whose rule is love and whose rulers are servants. But a democracy cannot hope to exist without faith in God. Ultimately it means the brotherhood of man. And that noblest fruit of history finds its only nourishing root in the Fatherhood of God. Without faith in God's purpose and power to establish a kingdom upon earth whose bond shall be love and whose badge of nobility shall be service, our radiant faith in the future of mankind becomes a baseless dream and a hopeless fancy.

We have won the war, and the treaty of peace has been signed. To-day a kaiserless world sings *Te Deums* to the God of righteousness for its deliverance from the hideous monster of political and military despotism. And our boys are coming home, crowned with honor and glory. Directly their long, long trail will end where yearning hearts and happy homes are waiting.

We have won the military conflict honorably and decisively, and yet we have not succeeded in establishing peace upon earth. Our world is far from stability and tranquility, even though the tempest of war no longer shakes its base. And our mood of frantic joy is fast ebbing. Even the most thoughtless amongst us seem to realize that we need something that no victorious generals and no sagacious diplomates can supply. That supreme need only Jesus Christ can supply, through whom we have access to God. In his gospel we have the clear

revelation of Gods purpose; and in his spirit we have the full manifestation of God's power of salvation. His spirit of unselfish love is the only weapon that can crush kaiserism. His truth is the only road to the true freedom of mankind. There is none other. "If the Son of man shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed." There will be no peace upon earth until the nations say, We will have this man Jesus to rule over us.

Never before was there such urgency to life up Jesus Christ that He may draw all men to Himself, and never was there an opportunity like ours to make Him the leader of mankind. And that, surely, is the supreme business of the churches of Christ throughout the world in this great tension-time. They must lift up Jesus Christ. Perhaps we have obscured His true glory with our theology. Perhaps we have lost Him in the clouds of our speculations. Then let us cease from theologizing Him. Let us realize Him as He walked and worked in Galilee, full of grace and truth. The world cares little for our theologies and politics. But it cares tremendously whether this universe is a dead mechanism or the abode of a living God. It cares tremendously whether this God is a celestial kaiser or a gracious Father. More than ever, men would know the meaning of life; their ground in the past and their goal in the future. There is within them a new hunger and thirst for moral strength and spiritual power. They have a new sense of the reality of sin and its heinousness, and they yearn for salvation from its guilt and power. They need Jesus Christ to satisfy and to save them. And they will follow Him if we will lift Him up by incarnating Him in our lives. As of old, He will draw men to Himself with His truth and grace. And His truth will make them free.

LANCASTER, PA.

IX.

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE OLD TESTAMENT CHRONOLOGICALLY ARRANGED. By Harlan Croshman, Ph.D., D.D., Professor of Hebrew Language and Literature, Auburn Theological Seminary. With a Foreword by Frank Knight Sanders, Ph.D., D.D., Director of the Board of Missionary Preparation, Sometime Woolsey Professor of Biblical Literature in Yale University. Price \$2.75. Pages xxxiv + 383. The Macmillan Company, New York, 1917.

There is today no lack of first class "Old Testament Introductions," but the author of this book tells us that he published his book under the strong conviction that such a book as his is needed. Frequently requests have come to him from laymen and clergymen for such a book. Moreover, his experience as a teacher of the Old Testament, so he tells us, has strengthened in him this conviction.

The inception of the book dates back to the years 1893-1899, though the bulk of it was written during the years 1899-1908. Subsequently it was carefully revised several times.

The book presents the Biblical material chronologically, in the following main groups: I., Primitive Times to the Conquest of Palestine; II., The Period of the Judges; III., The United Kingdom; IV., The Divided Kingdom; V., The Period of the Exile; VI., The Persian Period; VII., The Grecian Period. Each of these periods is treated under two heads: A, A general introduction to the literature of the period; B, A list of the material in detail with notes on "sources" and "chronology," including the statement of the reasons for the order adopted. At the end of the volume there are also two appendixes and four indexes.

The most characteristic feature of the book is this chronological arrangement of the Biblical material. The method of investigation and the results presented are not original. The general position, as the above outline of the book may suggest, is that of the historical school of Old Testament study. The author says in the preface to his book that his position in the main is that of the contributors of Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible. In the body of the book he however quite frequently does not tell the reader his own view, but simply presents the view or views of others.

The author did not prepare his book for the Biblical expert, but for readers and students of the English Bible, in colleges, universities and theological seminaries, also for members of advanced Bible classes and for private readers and students of the Bible who desire to read or study it in chronological order. He also says that his book "will serve the purpose of a *Vade-mecum* of the Old Testament" for "the busy minister, who may desire to know the conclusions of modern scholarship."

The book is chuckful of facts and views of different scholars; there are also numerous references in the text, but especially in footnotes, to literature in English on the Biblical material. The material is presented mainly in annalistic fashion, in outline form. Consequently the book is not a readable one and apparently it was not designed to be such. The book partakes therefore largely of the nature of an annalistic, though not exhaustive, collection of facts, views of other scholars, and references to kindred or relevant literature in English, presented in skeleton-like outline.

In its method of presentation the book is therefore annalistic rather than historical, that is, it is a chronological presentation of the Biblical material in annalistic fashion and he who picks it up with the expectation of finding in it a *Litteraturgeschichte* or a history of the Old Testament literature will be disappointed. An annalistic presentation of the Old Testament literature is one thing, a historical presentation of it is another and higher thing. Each has its place. Our author has furnished a chronicle of the Old Testament literature, and it would seem designedly so. He himself calls his book a *vade-mecum*.

The preparation of this chronological or annalistic guide to the literature of the Old Testament, so astoundingly full of facts, it goes without saying, required much valuable time as well as much arduous labor, and all who are in search for and in need of such a guide and especially the laymen and clergymen who frequently requested the author to recommend such a Biblical guide, before he had prepared his own, will certainly be thankful to their self-sacrificing and competent Biblical dragoman for the time and labor he expended upon his chronological or annalistic guide-book to the Old Testament in their behalf.

IRWIN HOCH DE LONG.

THE GOLDEN MILESTONE. By Frank Boreham. Price \$1.25 net. Pages 276. The Abington Press, New York and Cincinnati.

This Tasmanian essayist is the author of a number of books—"Faces in the Fire," "Mushrooms on the Moor," "Mountains in the Mist," "The Luggage of Life," "The Other Side of the Hill and Home Again," "The Silver Shadow," etc. "Boreham, the Australian, has won a large vogue in the English-reading world. Is he Brierley's successor as essayist for preachers?" says the *Methodist Review*. He is as yet not well known in America, evidently. But two of the above named books are in the Library of Congress at this writing. He is rapidly being discovered, however, in the United States.

Don't pronounce his name Bore'em, for that is certainly what he does not do, hints the *London Quarterly Review*, which says of "Mushrooms on the Moor": "There are twenty-five chapters in this book, and every one a new sensation." "If you have a confirmed taste for human nature and like to look on it through

lenses of humor and sympathy—get acquainted with Boreham." "His books are more than essays; they are motion pictures of a phosphorescent mind. The happy high heartedness of him is so infectious that to read him is a sheer delight." "A series of delightful, refreshing and suggestive essays. Each one of them is like a flower springing out of a place where you would least expect to find a flower, and bearing a bloom and a fragrance that surprise and exhilarate you. Australia seems to some of us over the edge of the horizon, outside of the world wherein we live, and for such a book to come out of that far away and unknown land, singing and flashing its way into our hearts, bringing quaint conceits, genuine wisdom, and stimulating ideas, almost takes our breath away."

These comments are fully confirmed by reading the twenty-four chapters of the book before us—*The Golden Milestone*. In the introduction we see his slant on life: "Like the gentle Elia, 'I find this world a very pretty place to live in'; and, standing here, beside my golden milestone, I have tried to point out a few of the things that make it so lovable." Unlovely things of course he finds as he brings out strikingly in a chapter on "Violets and Vipers" in which he shows the fallacy of the claim that one "finds God in Nature. He means that he finds God in violets. But Nature is not violets. Nature consists of *violets and vipers*."

The title of the book is the subject of one of the closing chapters, introduced by a quotation from Longfellow, "Each man's chimney is his Golden Milestone." The warmth and glow of a happy hearthstone is over all the chapters. They are restful, put one in good humor with himself and his situation and help him to feel at home in this beautiful and wonderful world.

Boreham is a Methodist minister, an Englishman, who went to New Zealand twenty odd years ago. He is a seer, an interpreter, and a charming stylist. He opens up nature and human nature for us with delightful flashes of insight. He refreshes our memory with allusions to well known poets, essayists, novelists, but also introduces us by apt quotation to books which we did not know about. There is much about Boreham that suggests Harbaugh and Bausman at their best as we read them in the old *Guardian*. These essays are not sermons, but their presentation of clear illuminated gripping thought will start thinking which will lead to some sermons worth while. Sentiment rich and true, there is in abundance, but not a smudge of sentimentality in the whole book. Do not the very titles of chapters awaken desire to read them? "Sleepy Hollow," "A Faggot of Thunderbolts," "A Nest of Singing Birds," "The Modesty of the Bush," "The Angel of the Kitchen," "A Philosophy of Pickles," "The Bloodhound of the Hedgerow."

HENRY H. RANCK.